DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 286 CS 009 238

AUTHOR Ketcham, Clay A., Ed.
TITLE Proceedings of the College Reading Association, Volume 4, Summer 1963.
INSTITUTION College Reading Association.
PUB DATE 63
NOTE 98p.; For other documents in this series, see CS 009 235-245. Small print.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Closed Circuit Television; *College Programs; Freshman Composition; Higher Education; Linguistics; Literacy Education; Paperback Books; Psychotherapy; *Reading Difficulties; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Research; *Reading Teachers; *Reading Tests; Study Habits; Study Skills
IDENTIFIERS *College Reading Association

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of the sixth annual meeting of the College Reading Association included the following papers: (1) "President's Report: Retrospect and Prospect" (Mrs. H. E. Ketcham); (2) "Can Reading Instruction Meet the Present Academic Challenge?" (P. D. Leedy); (3) "Hereditary Factors in Certain Reading Disabilities" (R. Clemens and G. Schiffman); (4) "Alias Dictus--Henry Higgins" (K. Bourn); (5) "Are We Educating Our Teachers of Reading?" (W. J. Massey); (6) "Objectives and Emphases in College Programs" (C. R. Colvin); (7) "New Developments in the Reading Test" (R. A. Ironside); (8) "Motivation and Reading" (G. G. Glass); (9) "Problems in Reading Research" (L. S. Braam); (10) "Environmental Influences on College Students' Study Habits and Attitudes" (M. M. Bott); (11) "Achieving Faculty Support for College Reading Programs" (A. M. Heilman); (12) "How Structured Psychotherapy Can Assist Students in Their Academic and Social Lives" (E. L. Phillips); (13) "New Developments in Adult Reading" (M. S. Joslow); (14) "A Survey of Literacy Education Courses" (R. W. Cortright); (15) "Individualized Reading in Freshman English" (P. Shaw); (16) "Linguistics and Reading: After Bloomfield What?" (S. H. Benedict); (17) "Reading Patterns among College Students" (I. L. Moe); (18) "The Impact of Paperback Books on Reading" (V. A. Giacco); (19) "The Responsibility of College Reading Directors beyond the Clinic Doors" (F. L. Christ); (20) "Current Status of Reading Programs in Government Agencies" (G. L. Stevens); (21) "Study-Skills Courses in Medical Schools" (G. Entwisle); (22) The Progressive Choice Reading Program" (M. Woolman); and (23) Implementing Reading Instruction by Closed-Circuit Television" (V. V. Swauger). (MS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED297286

COLLEGE READING ASSOCIATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James E Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS009238

Vol. 4 Summer 1963

No. 2

Table of Contents

C.R.A. Proceedings Volume IV, 1963:

President's Report: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT - Ketcham

CAN READING INSTRUCTION MEET THE PRESENT ACADEMIC CHALLENGE? - Leedy

HEREDITARY FACTORS IN CERTAIN READING DISABILITIES - Clemens & Schiffman

ALIAS DICTUS - HENRY HIGGINS - Bourn

ARE WE EDUCATING OUR TEACHERS OF READING? - Massey

OBJECTIVES AND EMPHASES IN COLLEGE PROGRAMS - Colvin

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE READING TEST - Ironside

MOTIVATION AND READING - Glass

PROBLEMS IN READING RESEARCH - Braam

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES ON COLLEGE STUDENTS' STUDY HABITS AND ATTITUDES - Bott

ACHIEVING FACULTY SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE READING PROGRAMS - Heilman

HOW STRUCTURED PSYCHOTHERAPY CAN ASSIST STUDENTS IN THEIR ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL LIVES - Phillips

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN ADULT READING - Joslow

A SURVEY OF LITERACY EDUCATION COURSES - Cortright

INDIVIDUALIZED READING IN FRESHMAN ENGLISH - Shaw

LINGUISTICS AND READING: AFTER BLOOMFIELD WHAT? - Benedict

READING PATTERNS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS - Moe

THE IMPACT OF PAPERBACK BOOKS ON READING - Giacco

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF COLLEGE READING DIRECTORS BEYOND THE CLINIC DOORS - Christ

CURRENT STATUS OF READING PROGRAMS IN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES - Stevens

STUDY-SKILLS COURSES IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS - Entwisle

THE PROGRESSIVE CHOICE READING PROGRAM - Woolman

IMPLEMENTING READING INSTRUCTION BY CLOSED-CIRCUIT TV - Swauger

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(over)

Table of Contents

C.R.A. Proceedings Volume V, 1964:

President's Report - Maxwell

THE LIBRARY IS YOUR READING TEST - Larrick

THE LEHIGH BETHLEHEM ITA STUDY - INTERIM REPORT FOUR - Mazurkiewicz

THE FIRST R: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION - Austin

THE GIFT OF SYLVIA ASHTON WARNER - Veatch

EVALUATION OF READING TESTS - Harris

DEVELOPING READING SKILLS IN ENGLISH AND SOCIAL STUDIES - Karlin

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF WORK BOOKS FOR COLLEGE READING - Wedeen

AN EXPERIMENT COMBINING CLOZE PROCEDURE WITH SPEED OF COMPREHENSION INSTRUCTION - Sawyer & Braam

SOME FACTORS ESSENTIAL IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF A COLLEGE READING PROGRAM - Price

INCONSISTENCIES IN TEACHER PREPARATION - Lane

LINGUISTICS AND READING - Allen

IMPROVING CRITICAL READING - Eller

DEVELOPING THE READING SKILLS OF MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE - Shepherd

THE USE OF PERSONALITY TESTS IN THE READING PROGRAM - Buchner

THE DYNAMIC FIELD OF VISION AS APPLIED TO LEARNING - Wiener

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR COLLEGE READING CENTERS - Murphy

MOTIVATION: KEY STEPS IN DEVELOPING LIFETIME READERS - Berg

PROGRESS REPORT: THE CHANDLER LANGUAGE-EXPERIENCE READERS - Carrillo

(over)

Proceedings

of

COLLEGE READING ASSOCIATION

Edited

by

CLAY A. KETCHAM

Director of Reading and Testing

Lafayette College

Volume IV

Summer, 1963

Easton, Pennsylvania

Copyright, 1963

COLLEGE READING ASSOCIATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRESIDENT'S REPORT: RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT
Mrs. Herbert E. Ketcham 1

CAN READING INSTRUCTION MEET THE PRESENT ACADEMIC CHALLENGE? ..... Paul D. Leedy 4

HEREDITARY FACTORS IN CERTAIN READING DISABILITIES
Clemens and Schiffman 7

ALIAS DICTUS—HENRY HIGGINS ..... Kenneth Bourn 14

ARE WE EDUCATING OUR TEACHERS OF READING? ..... Will J. Massey 17

OBJECTIVES AND EMPHASES IN COLLEGE PROGRAMS
Charles R. Colvin 22

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE READING TEST ..... R. A. Ironside 26

MOTIVATION AND READING ..... Gerald G. Glass 30

PROBLEMS IN READING RESEARCH ..... Leonard S. Braam 35

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES ON COLLEGE STUDENTS' STUDY HABITS AND ATTITUDES ..... M. M. Bott 39

ACHIEVING FACULTY SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE READING PROGRAMS
Arthur M. Heilman 43

HOW STRUCTURED PSYCHOTHERAPY CAN ASSIST STUDENTS IN THEIR ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL LIVES ..... E. L. Phillips 46

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN ADULT READING ..... M. S. Joslow 50

A SURVEY OF LITERACY EDUCATION COURSES ..... R. W. Cortright 54

INDIVIDUALIZED READING IN FRESHMAN ENGLISH ..... Phillip Shaw 57

LINQUISTICS AND READING: AFTER BLOOMFIELD WHAT?
Stewart H. Benedict 63

READING PATTERNS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS ..... Iver L. Moe 67

THE IMPACT OF PAPERBACK BOOKS ON READING ..... V. A. Giacco 70

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF COLLEGE READING DIRECTORS BEYOND THE CLINIC DOORS ..... F. L. Christ 72

CURRENT STATUS OF READING PROGRAMS IN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES ..... G. L. Stevens 76

STUDY-SKILLS COURSES IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS ..... George Entwisle 79

THE PROGRESSIVE CHOICE READING PROGRAM ..... Myron Woolman 82

IMPLEMENTING READING INSTRUCTION BY CLOSED-CIRCUIT TV
V. V. Swauger 85

PREFACE

The College Reading Association held its sixth annual meeting at the University of Maryland, College Park, on April 5-6, 1963. At a business meeting at the close of the sessions, the following were announced to serve as officers for the coming year.

Mrs. Martha Maxwell	President
M. Jerry Weiss	President-elect
Phillip Shaw	Director
A. T. Burrows	Director
Marjorie Johnson	Director
Leonard Braam	Director

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Retrospect and Prospect

Mrs. Herbert E. Ketcham

Lafayette College

Perhaps this is the year that will go down in the annals of history as the year of the 50 mile hike and the year without a major blast of criticism of reading in our schools and colleges. Maybe there is a connection between the two—when our news writers find a new hobby horse to ride, they put the old one out to pasture. And so, fellow members of the College Reading Association, that is where we are at the moment—out to pasture—with time to ruminate on the criticisms of our past performances and time to fatten ourselves up for the future years of working out our answers to the critics.

To be serious now, let me recapitulate what you all know—the major criticisms of reading in the past decade. Flesch dropped the first bomb with his criticism of the teaching of beginning reading. He touted phonics as the panacea for all problems in reading, basing his conclusions largely on several experiments. Thus he generalized from a few particulars and turned out a job of research that you or I would have rated D or F in Freshman Comp. Flesch created havoc with his bomb, but elicited no offensive action—merely scattered retaliative defensive maneuvers. Next came the attack by the council of Basic Education with many improbable claims and poorly documented criticisms. Again from our ranks has come no impartial scholarly counter-attack. Another skirmish from outside our ranks was caused when Trace published his so-called comparison of Russian and American schools. The section on reading consists largely of parallel facing pages giving the table of contents of Russian and American readers. As we all know, the labels of things do not necessarily indicate their true worth. But even more seriously, Trace appears not to have read the content of these readers. As a student of Russian, now in my eighth college semester, I have read, painfully and slowly, through some of these grade school Russian readers. It is true that they contain stories and poems by well known authors, but often these are relatively simple selections of animal stories and the like. Also there are prolific notes as to meanings of words, and interpretations. I am not here defending our readers nor criticizing the Russian readers. All I am saying is that Trace's book is neither a scholarly nor an accurate picture of the situation as it exists. Someone from our group should do an actual comparison of the two systems, making a real analysis of the content of textbooks, reading and social studies and others, to determine which system is superior. Also the use of library books and supplementary reading should be considered in a true comparison of the Russian and American systems.

So much for the more publicized critics. Of course, there are Hechinger, Conant, and Rickover. Much might be said of them, but their criticisms of education have been general not specific to reading.

All of these criticisms have come from outside our group. Truly scholarly research has been slow in answering these critics. Last year at this time we heard an appeal from Dr. Albert Mazurkiewicz, our former president, for us to criticize ourselves and thus to attain professional growth. We heard his appeal; have we heeded it? Have we gone even farther than criticizing ourselves; have we conducted scholarly research to cast light on the whole field of teaching reading, and further have we brought the results of our research before the public?

Some have! As I look over our program for the meetings here today and tomorrow, I find that a long look has been taken at phonics, and a new approach to problem readers has been born. (This was not meant to be a pun.) But I am looking forward to hearing about the Bourn method and I am anxious to see whether some of our members will take up the challenge to try this new method.

Another sign of our growth professionally has come from Dr. Mazurkiewicz. Last fall he, among a number of educators, invited Sir James Pitman and Mr. John Downing, the British exponents of the Initial Teaching Alphabet (ITA) to tell a number of Reading Specialists in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Delaware about this new development in the teaching of beginning reading. Later Dr. Mazurkiewicz went to England to study the program **in situ** and now is embarking on the first study in the United States to test the effectiveness of this new teaching medium. Other experiments, notably those in Cleveland and St. Louis, will probably get under way this fall. This is an example of the kind of scholarly leadership you and I must give if we are to make the members of CRA a professionally strong group.

Several of our other members are working on scholarly projects under various grants and we look forward to hearing the results of their research. Dr. Walter Pauk of Cornell is on a Fulbright Fellowship in Jamaica and Dr. Jeanne Chall, who addressed this group last year, has been working under a Carnegie grant to evaluate various methods of teaching reading. Mr. Stuart Benedict is doing research in the relation of linguistics to reading, and you will have an opportunity to hear him today. Perhaps many more of our members have begun research that will answer our critics, but have begun it with a scholarly impartiality and the courage to "junk" what proves useless. If I have omitted anyone of you, do let me know of your projects and I will include them in the proceedings.

Our own College Reading Association is growing as a professional organization. During this past year, we have, as an organization, formally established the **Journal of the Reading Specialist**, a unique forum in which new ideas, controversial subjects, and reviews can be bartered. The Board of Directors has established two commissions to conduct studies. The first commission—"On the Use of Paper Backs in Reading Programs"—will present a session tomorrow afternoon under the able leadership of Dr. M. Jerry Weiss who is chairman of this commission. The second commission we have established is still in its beginning phase, but we are happy to tell you

that a commission has been established to coordinate reading research. Much of the better research in reading has not found its way into print in the more widely known journals and those indexed in the Educational Index. Thus it is virtually lost to us. We envision that this commission will work to coordinate reading research, to help to avoid duplication of effort among graduate students, and to stimulate the publication of reading research in readily available journals. We will hear a paper by the Chairman of this commission, Dr. Leonard Braam of Syracuse University this afternoon.

So, individually and as a group we have responded to our former president's challenge last year—that we grow professionally.

But, we must not sit back and become smug. We must continue to grow. We must always keep a scholarly open mind with each new development in the field; we must be willing to listen and to learn. We must continue to develop new ideas and new methods, to test them, and to have the courage to discard them if they prove valueless. We must become more articulate and especially more literate in presenting the results of our scholarly work. Only as we meet these challenges, can we college teachers of reading stop being defensive and go on to achieve the professional scholarly status we so desire.

CAN READING INSTRUCTION MEET THE PRESENT ACADEMIC CHALLENGE?

Paul D. Leedy

American University

Today's concern with the college student and his reading skills contrasts sharply with the disesteem of reading as an intellectual discipline during the greater part of the history of American higher education. Let us look backward over that history to discern the attitude of the American college and university with respect to the student, his reading, and the universe of books.

On the north bank of the River Charles in 1636 Harvard College was founded—a medieval outpost of intellectualism in a New World. Its official languages were Latin and Greek; it decried the use of English within its walls, and it looked upon reading as an idle pursuit of no value to either scholar or gentleman. Books were for ornament, and while it had a collection of books, which it called its library, these were largely Latin and Greek philosophical or theological tomes to be studied in depth and pondered line by line, precept by precept. It was a common practice in the colonial and nineteenth century college to lock the library against the student body, to make it inconvenient for the student and the book to get together, and to downgrade reading as an intellectual pursuit in preference to the worthwhile endeavors of the truly enlightened: developing the ability to meditate and think and to contemplate the excellence of living a virtuous life.

So deep and so inexorable was that medievalism of an essentially Latin oriented curriculum that three centuries after the founding of Harvard, my own alma mater presented me with a diploma that to this day I have not been able to read! It purported to confer upon me (and I hope it did!) the degree of **Artium Baccalaureus** and my sheepskin announces that fact in the sonorous and, for me at least, unreadable Latin of medieval scholasticism. And some eight years later, near the end of the Great Depression, as though the first ordeal was not enough, my **Magister Artium** was likewise conferred in Latin with all the pomp and circumstance that might accompany the investiture of an Oxford don. That was the college of yesteryear. It was the college which many of us have known in spirit and in truth, a college that basically disdained the realm of books, that deemphasized reading, and that lived within the long shadow of medieval disciplines and practices.

Within such a collegiate framework, to suggest instruction in such an elementary matter as reading would have been stark insanity. Few colleges even as recently as a quarter of a century ago would have admitted readily that many of their student body could not read with the adequacy that a new age – an age of technological advance, space conquest, and continuing education – demands of a new type of student.

Speaking before the Congress of the United States on the occasion of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, Carl Sandburg recalled the words "keen and flashing" which Mr. Lincoln addressed to his war-time Congress, hoping that it would forget past tradition and accept the challenge of the years to come. Said the President, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present: we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves." Those words of Mr. Lincoln a century ago are highly appropriate to our common purpose and present theme. Academically, the stormy present is upon us. The college of tomorrow is demanding that we think anew and act anew in terms of the basic disciplines and educative processes; for men and women in the field of reading — and there is no more basic discipline for human enlightment and intellectual growth — the college of tomorrow is challenging us to disenthrall ourselves of convention, conservatism, and unimaginative methodology.

The college of tomorrow will be a vastly different institution from the one which most of us have known in the past. The demands in terms of dealing with the written word and teaching the student precisely what to do with the printed page will be staggering. "The dogmas of the quiet past will be inadequate for the stormy present!" There will be a new breed of students. They will be better students than we may have seen on the campus heretofore. Academically they will be more serious than their predecessor generations. There may be more of the bright and the gifted in the college classroom. Here is the challenge: we have thought very little as reading specialists about the needs of the superior student. They have their reading problems, too. But they are of a different kind, and of a higher order than most of us have dared to dream of.

We will have a larger proportion of foreign students on our campuses than ever before. Their reading problems are of a new and different kind. For them the English language as a channel of communication frequently presents a barrier across their academic path. Last year 53,107 foreign students from 143 countries and political areas were enrolled in 1,666 American colleges and universities — almost 10% increase over the year before. And this is just the beginning. 50% of these students are under graduates. These people have their reading problems — problems of a discrete and different type from those we have been accustomed to deal with. Our conventional thinking seems to have blinded our vision to a whole new area of challenge that is rapidly becoming imperative for our profession. I am somewhat distressed to see that our literature, our programs, our colloquies, our discussions play pretty much the same old tunes; the new themes go unsounded or unrecognized that they exist.

Studies are in the course of change. A new toughness in academic standards will be apparent — we are beginning to sense it already. Most of the study skills that we have been content to teach in the past — and thus offer as our stock in trade — will be largely outmoded for a vast segment of the college student body of the future. Many of them will come

having learned what we are now teaching. Whether we are aware of it or not the high school is catching up in terms of teaching what we now consider to be adequate study skills. With tighter admission standards many of the college students of tomorrow may come to the campus possessing what we now offer them in reading improvement and study skills programs. And what will poor robin do then?

A whole bizarre gadgetry will grow up: teaching machines, closed circuit instruction, audio visual materials, tape recordings, programmed textbooks, and methodological miracles and machines yet unconceived! How does all this mesh with the problem of reading? What new problems will arise for which the reading teacher needs an answer, and to which he needs an approach? How much thinking are we doing in terms of this present academic challenge – which is already upon us?

I may be wrong, but it seems to me that our stock in trade has been scant indeed. Listen to a group of reading people talk, and there are half a dozen principal concepts -- most of them twenty years or more old – which spin round and round like the prayer wheel of the oriental mystic: speed, comprehension, study skills, emotional disturbance, critical reading – and this is the limited vocabulary of our stock in trade. "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy future!"

At the American University we get a great many transfer students who come to us for their last two years. Many of these students – in fact most of them – have reading disabilities. But I am appalled when many of them tell me that they have had a course in reading improvement but "it didn't seem to help them very much." We do not seem to be striking at the root of the problem with a great many students. When I review a great deal of our instructional material I discern that we are oftentimes confused. We have, for example, again and again confused exhortation with exposition. To tell a person what to do is one thing; to tell him how to do it is quite another.

In our instructional materials we have a plethora of the first; there is precious little of the second! Repeatedly the students is exhorted: "Read this for meaning:" "Read it critically:" "Read it for speed"– and on and on. What the student needs to know is not what to do, but how he is to read for meaning, how he is to read critically, how he is to read for greater speed. Unless we can spell out with unmistakable clearness the mystery of the how, instead of repeating the bewildering what, we shall not be meeting the academic challenge.

Teachers of literature are notorious in that they do not teach their students to read. I have yet, in all my experiences with courses in literature, to have one teacher show me how to read a poem. It is one thing to talk about metaphors and similes, about length of line and type of feet. When you tell a student what the poet says, you are not teaching him to read a poem. And yet, very rarely have I seen spelled out by reading specialists just exactly the steps whereby a student who sits before a poem in the darkness of uncomprehension may, if he follow the

steps, be led to the light of understanding. Not only is this necessary with literature: the poem, the novel, the essay, but it is necessary with every academic discipline across the board. There must be a way to read the jargon of mathematics, but in all of my reading on reading I have never seen an adequate exposition as to how it is done!

What, then, do we mean when we prattle about comprehension? The need is not to talk more about comprehension; but to spell out unmistakably the way to comprehend.

If reading improvement is to become a respectable discipline — and well it might — then it behooves those of us who seek to make it such to come to grips with the problems of reading as these arise in the classroom, out of the textbook, and within the bewildered student's mind, and to find an exposition for that student's problems that he may come to grips successfully with the page of print.

This is the academic challenge of the present hour to those who would teach a youth to read.

HEREDITARY FACTORS IN CERTAIN READING DISABILITIES

Raymond L. Clemens

&

Gilbert B. Schiffman

University of Maryland School of Medicine

Students of human development have for many decades debated the relative importance of hereditary and environmental factors in the acquisition of specific skills. It is generally recognized that intelligence is determined by both genetic endowment and experiential phenomena. Reading disorders in persons of adequate intelligence, however, are usually considered to be pedagogic or psychologic problems which are affected little or not at all by genetic influence. It is the purpose of this paper, and the one to follow, to discuss the possible role of hereditary factors in certain types of reading disabilities and to recount our experience in a multi-disciplined diagnostic clinic with the familial occurrence of reading problems.

It is well know that impairment of communicative skills can result from neurologic damage. An example of this is found in the adult who has sustained a cerebral vascular accident with resultant dyslexia or aphasia. This type of overt neurological damage is a rare occurrence in children and young adults, however, and could not account for more than a very small fraction of learning disorders.[1], [2] More subtle cerebral

lesions, sometimes referred to as minimal brain damage, may result from injury before, during, or after birth and possibly accounts for a sizable portion of learning disorders. In the absence of firm evidence of neurological dysfunction, or other physical impairment, the possibility that biological phenomena contribute to reading disabilities frequently has been discounted. It should be borne in mind, however, that the usual clinical neurological examination is a relatively crude tool for the assessment of higher brain function. The possibility exists that brain dysfunction may exist in the absence of specific neurological signs.

Our interest in reading disorders arose from our experience with large numbers of primary and secondary school age children having unusual problems in acquiring reading skills. These ranged in severity from mild or moderate to extremely severe. Each child received a comprehensive evaluation consisting of detailed medical, neurologic, psychologic and audiologic examination. Psychiatric consultations were obtained as indicated, as were laboratory investigations including the electroencephalogram. Detailed family history revealed a surprisingly high incidence of reading problems in other family members.[3] Our search for etiologic influences included factors of intelligence, social and cultural deprivation, emotional disorders and educational opportunity. After exhaustive examination we were left with a group of children with severe reading problems the cause of which remained obscure. The findings, however, suggested the possibility of a subtle neurological problem akin to aphasia. The multiple occurrence of such problems in families further suggested the possibility of cognitive dysfunctions which might be genetically determined.

The literature on reading problems in children is extensive, with contributions from many disciplines including education, psychology, neurology, psychiatry, and pediatrics. The total literature is complex and the terminology is often confusing. Many physicians have tended to the view that there is a definable group of children with language and learning disorders which are due to neurological impairment and which may be inherited. To designate this condition they have used such terms as Specific Reading Disability, Strephosymbolia, Congenital Dyslexia and Congenital Word Blindness. In the opinions of other investigators there is a real question as to the existence of such an entity.

It seems important to establish whether or not certain types of reading disability may be determined by genetic transmission. The question is of obvious theoretical importance. From a practical viewpoint, if such an entity could be established, and if tests could be developed to find affected children early, partial prevention would be possible in the sense of early individualized treatment and avoidance of secondary emotional complications resulting from continuing frustration and academic failure.

Recognizing that there is controversy as to the existence of the entity specific reading disability, one may tentatively define the term as an

unusual difficulty in reading in children of average intelligence, or better, whose problem is not due to poor vision, inadequate educational exposure, obvious physical handicap or causative emotional factors.

Review of the literature reveals that many authors have noted the familial occurrence of reading problems and postulated that the disorder could be genetically determined. Only a few of these reports will be noted here. Thomas[4] in 1905, reported the familial occurrence of what he termed specific dyslexia in two families. In one of them two brothers were affected, and in the other, seven children and their mother.

In 1907, Hinshelwood[5] published in his studies of 11 siblings, four of whom he considered to be "dyslexic." Stephenson[6] in 1907, found six affected persons in three successive generations and postulated that dyslexia follows a recessive mode of inheritance. Warburg[7] in 1911, studied 21 children with dyslexia and found secondary cases in 20 of the families. The important work of Orton was done in the third and fourth decades of this century.[8] He pointed out that two or more cases of various language disorders including reading and writing disabilities and speech problems, are often found in the same family and maintained that there was a genetic relationship among these conditions. He also noted a marked predominance of males and postulated a sex influenced genetic inheritance. Eustis[9] in 1947, observed unusual body clumsiness, incomplete determination of dominance and speech problems in certain children with reading problems. He observed that there was frequently a history of delayed speech development and mechanical speech problems in these children as well as in their near relatives. In his series of 23 cases, of what he terms specific reading disability, he found a positive family history of language disorders in 86%. One of the most detailed and one of the few well controlled large studies was published by Hallgren in 1950.[10] He studied 276 cases of reading disability and 212 controls and concluded that reading disabilities follow an autosomal dominant mode of inheritance. He found reading disorders in 88% of the families of his index cases.

Several important objections may be raised against the hypothesis that inheritance may account for the multiple occurrence of reading problems in families. 1) If inadequate stimulation, poor motivation, emotional disorder or cultural deprivation cause reading retardation in one family member, it is reasonable to expect that near relatives may be similarly involved. 2) A condition as common as reading problems could be expected to occur in several family members on a basis of chance alone in some instances.

The study of identical and non-identical twins may yield valuable information in understanding the contributing roles of hereditary and environmental factors in the causation of various conditions. It is of interest to review the available data on twins with reading retardation. Hermann reported studies on 45 sets of twins in whom at least one was found to have a reading problem.[11] Of 33 pairs of non-identical twins, one

of whom had reading retardation, 33% of the co-twins were similarly involved. Among 12 sets of identical twins, however, there was found to be 100% concordance. In other words, if one identical twin had a reading problem, all of the co-twins had a similar disability. Although the numbers are small, the findings are of considerable interest and lend support to the hypothesis that genetic factors are involved, since twins who are non-identical were found to have significantly less concordance for reading disability than did those twins with identical genetic material.

The central issue that a specific modality dysfunction could be related to inheritance deserves exploration. In this regard it is of interest to note the studies of Shaffer.[12] He has recently demonstrated a specific cognitive deficit in individuals with gonadal aplasia or Turner's syndrome. Turner's syndrome is a highly specific and rigidly identifiable clinical condition which is associated with a specific chromosomal abnormality. These persons have only 45 chromosones with one of the x chromosones being absent. No other clinical or pathological disorder presents such a chromosomal abnormality. Shaffer demonstrated a highly consistent pattern of cognitive strengths and weaknesses among these individuals, similar to that observed in certain types of brain damage. His patients, on the WISC and on the WAIS, were found to have high Verbal IQ's and low performance IQ's with a mean difference between the two of 20 points. They were found to be especially poor in those skills which had to do with perceptual organization. His findings suggest that the specific cognitive deficit observed is characteristic of the syndrome of gonadal aplasia and may stem from an organic deficit related to the chromosomal anomaly involved. This study is the first report that such a rigidly diagnosable biological entity has been found to be correlated with a specific modality dysfunction and lends support to the thesis that such phenomena may be at least partially inborn or constitutional.

One of the points on which most authors agree is that reading problems are more common in males than in females.[13] It has been suggested that the greater incidence of reading problems among boys may be due to greater pressure on boys to do well as a preparation for earning a living. Another viewpoint is that the higher incidence in males is related to genetic influence and is manifest in delayed neurologic maturation or neurologic dysmaturation.[14] We should keep in mind the possibility, if not the probability, that multiple factors are operational.

Out of our study and experience we have arrived at the following observations:

1) There exists a group of children of adequate intelligence who are seriously retarded in reading in spite of good instruction over prolonged periods of time. In many of these youngsters there is no demonstrable physical, emotional, or environmental cause.
2) These problems are commonly associated with a family history of reading problems and language disabilities in near relatives.

3) In our clinic the ratio of children with reading disabilities is four males to one female.

4) There is no higher incidence of visual refractive errors among children with reading problems than among children without reading problems.

5) Specific positive neurological signs are uncommon in children with reading retardation. However, they are not infrequently very awkward in body movements, especially those which have to do with fine motor coordination and balance. These children may be poorly lateralized or show signs of mixed dominance.

6) Psychological testing may show a wide disparity between verbal and performance scores on the WISC, and this disparity may be in either direction.

7) Psychological studies may also reveal problems in spatial orientation and directionality. These children may have unusual difficulty in reproducing geometric designs, often showing reversals and rotations.

8) Speech problems and language disorders, at times overt and at times very subtle, are more common in children with reading problems than among normal readers.

9) Electroencephalograms are frankly abnormal or borderline abnormal in 50% of severely retarded readers.

In summary then, there is a group of children, of adequate intelligence who are severely retarded in reading whose problms are not due to poor instruction, inadequate motivation, social or cultural deprivation or detectable emotional disorder. They show no evidence of brain damage and their histories yield no suggestive evidence of brain insult. These cases seem to represent specific cognitive defects in dealing with visual symbols and resemble aphasia and dyslexia resulting from brain injury. There may be several cases in one family. Although the presently available facts do not permit rigid etiologic designation, the possibility exists that these disorders represent specific modality dysfunctions which are related to genetic transmission.

Footnotes

1. Kawi, A.A., and Pasamanick, B.: Prenatal and Paranatal Factors in the Development of Childhood Reading Disorders. **Monograph of the Society for Research in Child Development**, 24:4, 1959.
2. Clemmens, R. L.: Minimal Brain Damage in Children. **Children**, 8:179-183, 1961.
3. Clemmens, R. L., Jantz, E. M. & Schiffman, G.: Reading Disability as a Familial Characteristic. **South. Med. Jour.**, 55:1329, 1962.
4. Thomas, C. J.: Congenital Word Blindness and Its Treatment. **Ophthalmoscope**, 3:380, 1905.
5. Hinshelwood, J.: Four Cases of Congenital Word Blindness Occurring in the Same Family. **Brit. Med. Jour.**, 2:1229, 1907.
6. Stephenson, S.: Six Cases of Congenital Word Blindness Affecting Three Generations of One Family. **Ophthalmoscope**, 5:482, 1907.
7. Warburg, F.: Uber Die Angeborene Wordblindheit Und Die Bedeutung Ihrer Kenntis Fur Den Unterricht. **Ztschr. F. Kinderforsch**, 1C:97, 1911.
8. Orton, S. T.: **Reading, Writing and Speech Problems in Children**. W. W. Norton, N. Y., 1937.
9. Eustis, R. S.: Specific Reading Disability. **New Eng. Jour. Med.**, 237:242, 1949.
10. Hallgren, B.: Specific Dyslexia. **Acta Psychiatrica et Neurologica** (Copenhagen) Supple. 65, 1950.
11. Hermann, K., and Norrie, E.: Is Congenital Word Blindness a Hereditary Form of Gerstmann's Syndrome? **Psychiatrica et Neurologia** (Basel), 136:59-73, 1958.
12. Shaffer, J. W.: A Specific Cognitive Defect in Gonadal Aplasia (Turner's Syndrome. **J. of Clin. Psych.**, 17:403-406, 1962.
13. Money, J.: **Reading Disability**, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1962.
14. Ingram, T. T.: Pediatric Aspects of Specific Development Dysphasia, Dyslexia and Dysegraphia. **Cerebral Palsy Bulletin**, 2:248, 1960.

19

PART II

The basic responsibility of the public schools is to attempt to educate each pupil to the full extent of his capacity. In order to carry out this philosophy it is often necessary to provide special services and programs for pupils with problems. For a multitude of reasons, there are pupils within any system who are not reading at a level comparable with their potential. Ideally, these pupils are identified and remediated in the regular classroom by proper grouping and instruction. However, from experience we know that this is not always possible nor practical. For many of these children it is necessary that special reading programs be provided at the elementary and secondary levels to supplement the development program.

Recently the literature has reported several studies evaluating the merits of these supplementary programs. Baltimore County has been involved in such an evaluation. The results indicate the tremendous advantage of early identification. It appears that pupils with reading disabilities identified as early as the 2nd grade have over ten times as great a chance of being remediated in a prescribed period as a comparable disability detected in the 9th grade.

Table 1. Percentages of Corrective Reading Pupils Reading at Their Proper Level at End of 1960/61 year.

Grades	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Extraclassroom corrective instruction received	82	46	42	18	8	10	11	6
Extraclassroom corrective instruction not received	18	6	6	3	1	.5	.25	.25

Emphasis must be placed upon early identification and placement in the proper program before an individual's problem becomes too complex. No longer can we afford to wait for the child to be referred to special services only after continual academic failure, atypical behavior or over-aggresive parents.

A group of authorities alerted to the need for early diagnosis and recognizing the limitations of our present pedagogical techniques are turning to an interdisciplinary approach to develop the proper tools.

In investigating the many possible factors involved in reading disabilities one is impressed by two facts:

1. Many special reading programs report that the ration of male to female pupils is about 4 or 5 to 1.
2. School authorities continually report clusters of children within individual families as having severe reading problems.

The occurrence of the sex and familial conditions leads one to hypothesize that the etiology of some percentage of reading disorders may have a genetic component.

In an attempt to test out this possibility we screened our records. The following results summarize the data compiled up to the present time.

Table 2

Family	#	Age	Sex	Grade	Intelligence V	P	FS	Achievement WRRA	WRRA	Instr. Level	Hand Speed	KEO	Bender	Lat.	Achievement vs Retardation	Comments
I	1	8	M	1R	92	101	96	1.4	1.6	RR	-	abnormal	abnormal	mixed	Ret.	
	2	6	M	1	103	106	104	1.3	1.5	RR	-	abnormal	abnormal	R	Ret.	
	3	11	M	5	116	113	116	4.2x	4.4	3	3.6	normal	abnormal	R	Ret.	
	4	10	M	4	-	-	109	1.7	1.9	1	below 2.0	normal	abnormal	mixed	Ret.	
	5	9	M	3R	104	118	112	2.6x	2.4	2	below 2.0	abnormal	abnormal	mixed	Ret.	
	6	39	M	8xx				4.2	4.6	4	8.6	normal		R	Ret.	
	7	43	F	12				10+	10+	9+	10+	abnormal		R	Ach.	
II	1	10	M	4	96	92	93	1.6	1.7	1	below 2		abnormal	R	Ret.	
	2	12	M	6	97	100	99	3.4	3.3	2	2.2		?	R	Ret.	
	3	13	M	7	100	100	100	3.9	3.3	3	3.4		abnormal	mixed	Ret.	
	4	15	F	10	116	129	125	12.0	11.3	9+	10.4+		normal	mixed	Ach.	
	5	39	F	12	103	103	103	11+	11+	9+	10.4+		normal	mixed	Ach.	
	6	42	M	12	117	105	113	8.8	9.0	8	10.4+		abnormal	L	Ret.	
III	1	7	F	1	99	104	101	1.9	1.8	1P	-		normal	mixed	Ach.	
	2	9	F	2	89	101	94	3.5	3.1	3	3.5		?	mixed	Ach.	
	3	11	F	5	116	104	112	6.2	5.4	5	5.8		normal	R	Ach.	
	4	12	M	6	101	103	102	3.3	2.7	3	3.9		?	mixed	Ret.	
	5	13	M	7	87	97	91	3.1	3.5	2	4.1		abnormal	R	Ret.	
	6	15x	M	Sp.Ed	77	82	77xxx	2.5	2.1	1P	3.8		abnormal	R	Ret.	
	7	16	M	10	105	96	102	7.1	5.3	5	9.0		?	R	Ret.	
	8	18	F	12	107	107	107	11+	11+	9+	10.4+		normal	R	Ach.	
	9	19	M	11	97	84	91	7.7x	5.5	6	9.4		abnormal	R	Ret.	
	10	41	F	12	125	121	125	11+	11+	9+	10.4+		normal	R	Ach.	
	11	43	M	10xx	112	116	110	8.9	8.0	7	10.4+		?	mixed	Ret.	
IV	1	8	M	1	89	93	91	0.0	0.0	RR	-		abnormal	R	Ret.	Art Prob RR
	2	10	F	3	79	82	78xxx	2.5	2.6	1	1.8		abnormal	R	Ret.	Art Prob RR
	3	12	M	5	96	118	107	2.6	1.4	1	3.2		abnormal	R	Ret.	Art Prob RR
	4	13	M	6	84	108	95	5.3	3.8	5	5.8		?	R	-	A Art Prob RR
	5	35	F	8	104	104	104	8.8	8.6	9	9.4		?	R	Ach.	A Art Prob RR

x Received 2 yrs. of remedial reading
xx Dropped out of school
xxx Possibility of average capacity

Table 3

Family	#	Age	Grade	Intelligence V	P	FS	Achievement WRRA	Instr. Level	Lat.	Sex	Achievement vs Retardation
I	1	7	1			93	0.3	RR	mixed	M	Ret.
	2	8	3			108	3.8	3	mixed	F	Ach.
	3	10	4			118	5.2	4	R	F	Ach.
	4	14	8			100	4.7	3	R	M	Ret.
	5	17	10*	85	103	93	4.8	5	mixed	M	Ret.
	6	38	8x	77	96	85	6.4	5	L	M	Ret.
	7	37	12	not available			11+	9+	R	F	Ach.
II	1	7	2			118	4.6	3	R	F	Ach.
	2	9	4			103	5.5	5	R	F	Ach.
	3	12	6			106	3.2	2	R	M	Ret.
	4	13	7			100	3.6	2	R	M	Ret.
	5	42	12	100	125	113	8.4	7	R	M	Ret.
	6	44	12	not available			11+	9+	R	F	Ach.
III	1	8	2			100	3.2	3	R	F	Ach.
	2	9	4			97	2.1	1	R	M	Ret.
	3	12	6			101	2.8	2	L	M	Ret.
	4	13	8			89	3.2	3	mixed	M	Ret.
	5	40	12	not available			11+	9+	mixed	M	Ach.
	6	37	7*	not available			3.2	-	mixed	M	Ret.
	7	37	9*	88	104	95	5.2	5	R	F	Ret.
IV	1	6	1			108	0.3	RR	L	F	Ret.
	2	8	3			101	3.9	4	L	F	Ret.
	3	8	3			127	4.2	4	L	F	Ach.
	4	11	5			104	2.6	2	R	M	Ret.
	5	14	8			96	3.9	3	mixed	M	Ret.
	6	36	12	not available			11+	9+	L	M	Ach.
	7	35	10*	86	89	86	6.2	6	R	F	Ret.
V	1	9	4			136	7.8	5	R	F	Ach.
	2	10	5			128	2.1	1	R	M	Ret.
	3	11	5			108	2.3	1	R	M	Ret.
	4	14	7			118	3.9	4	R	M	Ret.
	5	16	10			116	11+	9+	mixed	F	Ach.
	6	17	11			109	11+	9+	mixed	M	Ach.
	7	40	12	not available			11+	9+	mixed	M	Ach.

* Dropped out of school

The next step is to enlarge the present sampling and to design a comprehensive experiment to test the hypothsis.

If an expanded study supports these findings the research indications for school authorities are quite obvious.

1. A more comprehensive case history might alert the school personnel to those children "predisposed" to possible future reading problems.
2. Special readiness curriculum might benefit this type of pupil.

I do not really know if the genetic hypothesis can help us in our search for clues to early identification. Time and good research will tell However, there is one thing I do know: We can no longer allow our children to go through years of agonizing frustration before we recognize their disability and attempt to remediate them.

The challenge is here. Let us stop arguing about the merits of the different pedagogical procedures and magic panaceas, and work towards an effective preventive program.

ALIAS DICTUS — HENRY HIGGINS

Kenneth Bourn

Baltimore County Schools

A farmer working in the field cried out for help. His wife and two sons heard his cry. The wife went immediately to the field carrying the spoon with which she was mixing bread dough. Upon hearing his father's cry, the eldest son ran to the field with a heavy hammer, for he had been shoeing the horse. Quickly, the youngest son came from another part of the field where he had been digging potatoes. With him he brought the spade. Each member of the family had been receptive to the cry for help. Each had responded quickly. Each had carefully brought with him the tool most helpful to him. All this was to no avail, for the farmer had been bitten by a poisonous snake. A spoon for blending bread, a hammer for shoeing horses, or a spade for digging potatoes could not draw the poison from his wound.

This may seem to be a strange and unacademic tale, but I hope it will serve to illustrate my point. Did the farmer in the story die? I don't know. But, I do know that "farmers" are dying in our schools daily. Every day good classroom teachers hear the cry of students who need, and want to learn. In most cases the teachers respond quickly, taking with them whatever tools are available and most familiar. In too many cases their efforts prove of no more value than those of the loyal family responding to the farmer's cry.

We have all the ingredients of a successful conclusion and yet we fall short. Why? Let me propose that we should take a longer look at the problem situation before we rush forth with a solution. If the farmer's family had known the situation causing the cry for help, I question whether they would have responded as they did. If the advocates of traditional phonics programs knew the situation in which we try to cope with non-readers, I am sure their response would be different, also.

Let me relate to you the corner of this "patchwork quilt" of reading problems with which I am most concerned. All my students are seated in junior high classrooms: seventh, eighth, and ninth grades. Within any one classroom the reading level may range over six or seven years. However, most have only a three to four year range.

The thirty-five to forty students in the class have had no fewer than seven years of training in "reading type" skills. I have difficulty trying to imagine all the truly devoted teachers, the many different methods and devices tried, the countless days of classroom instruction that these students represent. The true tragedy is that they are still below grade level in such a basic learning skill.

As I visit such a class and hear another lesson in reading skills, I can not subdue the voice of Henry Higgins pointing out it is "a" not "i", "o" not "ou"—"The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain," while thirty-five little faces cry out, "Just you wait, Henry Higgins, just you wait", as loudly as Eliza did.

Eliza's frustration by the demands of Henry Higgins was no greater than that of these students as they face their teacher. The teacher is frustrated because the traditional phonic methods she has been using with great success have no effect on these people. The students know the teacher is a good one. They know she is doing her very best. They know that the method has been used to teach their friends. But, most of all, they know that they are not learning the skills of written communication. This realization is often the key stone in their conviction that, "I'm stupid, unworthy of the expense of education and a disgrace to my family and friends."

Are there many "Eliza's" in our schools today? I have no statistical evidence, but I would venture to guess that there may be as many as 4,000,000 such persons. Why are they not more in evidence than they are? In many cases, these people have been labeled as slow or non-readers. As slow or non-learners, these students are put aside and not taken as a part of the general school population. The students say that they are "stupid". The parents want nothing to do with them. The teachers try, but the students do not respond to the traditional methods. Final justification for setting this group aside is the standardized intelligence test. Here we have nationally accepted proof that the student is far below average in intelligence. May I point out that this test is usually given in a form of written communication. Since the student has trouble reading and writing, the score given by the standardized group intelligence test has little or nothing to do with his intelligence. Yet, this test is used to set the group aside and thus out of the general line of development.

Tragedy breeds tragedy. As the student seeks a hole into which he can crawl to escape the humiliation of his situation, he is led to misconduct as the only way out of the classroom. From the classroom he goes to the disciplinarian's office. Once again the student finds no understanding of his situation. There seems to be no alternative but to leave school. The faster the snowball goes, the bigger it grows; the bigger it grows, the faster it goes.

To avoid the title of debunker, I would propose experimentation with emphasis upon simplicity and understanding. The need is for instant success in the area of written communication. To remove the Henry Higgins image, the preparatory demands upon the student must be kept as simple and as meaningful as possible. Exceptions should be eliminated as much as possible. Written communication should be started on the grade level as soon as possible. I have a plan to set before you as a step in this direction.

The Bourn Sound Method has been "played with" for three years. It has been found valuable by good classroom teachers in: the teaching of spelling to gifted students; the introduction of new written concepts to average students, instruction among slow learner groups who, within one month, advanced their written communication level to that of their listening level; and group guidance.

This system needs experimentation in reliable surroundings. So far only hit and miss application by my sympathetic friends has been possible. But their findings warrant greater use and experimentation to help not only the four million Eliza's in our schools today but the average and superior students to do a better job, in less time, with greater ease.

Similar to Sir James Pitman's "Augmented Roman Alphabet", the Bourn Sound Method is based upon a constant sound-symbol association. Each symbol represents one sound. In this way exceptions are eliminated, and the student can attack a word with full confidence that if he pronounces each symbol as he should, he will pronounce the word correctly, without exception. Unlike the "Augmented Roman Alphabet", the Bourn Sound Method employs only thirty-five symbols. The sounds are related to the symbols by a picture of a common object for each symbol. The name of the object pictured is tied to the symbol and thus the symbol-sound relation is formed. All the symbols used in the Bourn Sound Method are familiar to the students. This make the tranfer back to "social reading" easier for the student.

Wuns thē stūdent iz ābl tōō rēd sound-rīting, hē then kan rēd enithing riten in this fōrm. Grād levl iz contrōld bī thē stūdent's abiliti tōō undēr-stand thē vōkabūleri. This iz genēralī nō problem; thē stūdent kan ūz-hōōlali undērstand if hē kan hēr thē wērdz.

Tēchērz fīnd rīting in sound iz kwīt ēzē wuns thāt lērn thē simblz and sounds. Sound rīting iz riten just az yōō wood spēk, aksent and ol. Aksent iz nō problem. If thē students kan undērstand you when you spēk, thā kan undērstand yōōr aksent in rīting.

Az yōō sēe, thē fōrm ov thē wērdz in sound-rīting iz not substanshali difērent from thē shōshel fōrm. Afēr thē stūdent haz red an ītem in sound-

rīting, hē kan ēzili rēd it in sōshel rīting. Nevēr iz thē stūdent led to aksept sound-rīting az an end in itself.

Thē stūdent iz inkerejd tōō rīt whut hē haz on hiz mīnd. If hē duz not nō thē korekt sōshel speling, hē mā ūz sound spelling and thē tēchēr wil akspet it if hē wērks tōō improōv his sōshel speling.

Tōō help brij the gap tōō korekt sōshel speling, thē Bōrn Sound Methud māks ūs ov ā sound-spelling chort. Thē sound-spelling chort iz kwīt līk ā multiplikāshun tābl. It māks ūs ov ekspōnents and sound fōrmz tōō lōkāt a lojikl patērn tōō ā mōst illojikl langgwij. The student iz nevēr tot tōō spel eni wā but sōsheli. Wuns ā wērd kan bē speld, it kan bē red and thē stū-dent is thus inkerejd tō improōv both rēding and speling at thē sām tīm.

ARE WE EDUCATING OUR TEACHERS OF READING?

Will J. Massey

University of Maryland

A recent report, "The Shape of Education for 1962-63,"[1] states that college freshmen do more advanced work than their predecessors did five or ten years ago, and that high schools are doing a better job than they have done heretofore. Such statements are comforting in the times of Trace, Walcutt, and Rickover. A review of the reports of research and articles presenting the views of leaders in the field of reading instruction leads one to believe that children today are better readers than were children of X years ago.

Why, then, are educators assailed with criticism for failure to provide first-rate schools? Let us examine some of the strengths and weaknesses in teacher education, pre-service and in-service, in an attempt to evaluate the validity of some of the criticisms.

Strengths of Pre-Service Programs for Elementary-school Teachers

After examining programs in teachers' colleges and schools of education, Travers concludes that the intensive training received makes each student "a well-rounded individual eminently qualified to guide the youth in our schools."[2]

Austin[3] cites as evidence of improvement in teacher education the facts that (1) educators are concerned, renewing efforts to make improvements and (2) educators are willing to re-examine reading practices that have been embraced for years.

Karlin[4] lists many changes that are being made by universities. Pre-service experiences that are being modified or initiated include: (1) the development of understandings as to how children grow and develop, with particular emphasis on environmental factors; (2) assistance in relating

theory and practice; (3) the extension of psychological principles to facilitate the learning process; and (4) devotion of much time to learning how to develop reading skills and extend reading interests. Austin finds that:

> . . . in the overall baccalaureate program the quality of students majoring in elementary education is higher now than at any time during the past decade and presumably higher than at any time . . .[5]

She also found that most colleges require certain courses in teaching language arts. While the impact of her reports has not been revealed in the literature, one may assume that changes such as those made by the University of Maryland (addition of four courses in the teaching of reading and redesigning of two courses) have been initiated or accomplished in other institutions.

Weaknesses of Pre-Service Programs for Elementary School Teachers

Gray's[6] finding that only three states require a specific course in the teaching of reading emphasizes the necessity for teachers' colleges and schools of education to provide (as partial requirements for graduation) courses that will develop teachers for the elementary schools who are adequately prepared to teach reading. His sampling of teachers' colleges in 32 states reveals that "course offerings in reading vary in semester hours from none to 20 or more."

Answers to letters sent to 35 reading specialists and outstanding leaders in school systems reveal the following weaknesses:

1. lack of professional preparation in reading on the part of many teachers in elementary schools,
2. limited amount of preparation . . . provided in some parts of the country for certain positions,
3. failure to organize pre-service training so as to relate theory and practice effectively,
4. poor sequence of courses which prevents maximum progress[7], and
5. failure to cultivate the personal qualities and the essential competencies for successful participation on the part of all engaged in promoting growth in and through reading.[8]

A 1961 survey of the preparation of the reading personnel in one county system reveals that over one-third of the respondents could not meet the minimum requirements of the Committee on Professional Standards of the International Reading Association, while approximately one-fifth had taken more than 19 graduate hours in reading courses.[9]

Teachers in the elementary school indicate that one of their chief concerns is the teaching of reading,[10, 11, 12, 13] betraying the fact that their preparation has been inadequate.

Weaknesses revealed by the Harvard-Carnegie Study[14] are caused by (1) the lack of screening of students before admittance to teacher education, (2) a specialized curriculum with excessive emphasis on professional and education courses rather than liberal arts, (3) inadequate time spent in courses in methods of teaching reading (time ranged from three semester

hours to less than 12 clock hours spent on the teaching of reading), and (4) the inadequacy of the student-teaching experience. This section may be concluded with Gray's inference that "by the time most teachers enter service they have had some professional training in reading but are still inadequately prepared to teach it effectively. They feel genuinely handicapped and are eager for help."[15, 16]

Strengths of Pre-Service Programs for Secondary-school Teachers

Faculty members interviewed by Austin[17] feel that secondary-education majors perform better academically than do elementary-education majors. Smith finds that subject-matter teachers are taking reading courses in number in an attempt to help students read in the special subject areas. She says that "on the whole, growth in this area is vigorous and healthy."[18] An encouraging note is sounded by Strang when she mentions that many kinds of courses in high-school reading have been developed, covering "a range from a rather limited single course to a sequence leading to a master's degree, professional diploma, or doctorate."[19] In many institutions secondary-school teachers can secure courses, on both the undergraduate and the graduate level, that will help them to develop the reading skills of their students in reading classes, English classes, and content-area classes. The old cliche, "Every teacher a teacher of reading", can and should be made a reality.

Weaknesses of Pre-Service Programs for Secondary-school Teachers

As poorly prepared as are many new teachers for the elementary schools, their inadequacy is minuscule in comparison with that of the secondary-school teachers. Morrison reports, in summarizing the Harvard-Carnegie study, that "pre-service education is sometimes absent, occasionally abstract, and frequently abbreviated."[20] This observation is corroborated by Karlin, who reviewed plans for strengthening teacher preparation, when he says that few, if any, content-area teachers have ever received training in the teaching reading.[21] In a state which recently mandated the teaching of reading in all junior high schools, a sampling of 369 teachers of the 993 secondary schools of the state reveals that half the teachers have no semester hours in reading, 19 per cent have one to three hours, 11 per cent have four to nine hours, while 20 per cent have twelve or more hours.[22] The superintendent of the same state feels that "fewer problems would have been present if teacher preparation had been better."[23] Wiltse cites inadequacies in the preparation of one hundred candidates for teaching positions in nearly all curricular areas from all over the nation. He says that "Not a single candidate had any notion about how to approach secondary-school reading problems,"[24] having had no experience except student teaching.

The insufficient preparation of teachers at both the elementary-school and the secondary-school level implies that steps must be taken to strengthen the pre-service preparation of teachers, particularly at the higher level, if our children are to receive the kind of instruction in reading that will develop their full potential as contributing members of modern society.

Strengths of In-Service Programs

Austin[25] reports that there are programs, predominantly of an informal nature, the success of which depends almost completely on the individuals in charge of the programs. Her co-worker is convinced that the deficiencies in the in-service preparation of teachers "preclude the possibility that the baccalaureate education will sustain the young educator through a lifetime of successful teaching."[26] Hence it is inevitable that the local school, the teachers' colleges, and the schools of education must assume the responsibility for continual up-grading of the teachers of reading. Karlin states that the awareness on the part of universities that teachers and supervisors need to continue their professional growth has "impelled graduate schools to institute special training programs in reading and provide assistance in this field of schools which seek it."[27] Graduate schools have assumed the responsibility of (1) developing graduate programs leading to advanced degrees, (2) concentrating on educational psychology to broaden the understanding of the educational program, (3) the strengthening of methods courses to provide broader and more comprehensive experiences in reading at all levels, (4) relating research findings and conclusions from disciplines concerned with problems of reading to theory and practice of teaching reading, and (5) providing consultants to the schools.

Gray lists two types of programs that are held prior to the opening of school: (1) orientation meetings for new teachers prior to the opening of schools and (2) workshops to examine the record of the previous year so that plans for improvement in the reading program can be made for the ensuing year. He also lists 9 other types of practices that are provided throughout the year. "Thus, school systems are endeavoring to work constructively with teachers and to enhance their professional preparation in the field of reading."[28]

Weaknesses of In-Service Programs

The increasing numbers of practices being assumed by colleges of education, teachers' colleges, and local school systems should not dull our senses to the urgent need for more quantity as well as quality in the in-service education of teachers. Morrison has alerted us to this need by his observation that ". . . in-service education is sporadic, sophomoric, and/or soporific."[29] Teachers balk at in-service programs because their needs and interests are ignored in the mass meetings which annually re-hash content. They object to programs that are too directive (teachers are called together and told what to do and how to do it) as well as those that are non-directive (no administrative leadership is provided). ". . . after-school and Saturday morning meetings, overabundance of theoretical concepts, and the absence of realistic conditions surrounding demonstrations" are equally resisted.[30]

For the most part teachers' colleges and colleges of education assume little responsibility for on-the-job training of their graduates. The effectiveness of the practices that they do accept depends too often on the personality of the individual who assumes the responsibility.

Recommendations

A review of the literature reveals both strengths and weaknesses in the pre-service and the in-service preparation of teachers of reading. Pre-service programs which adequately prepare teachers are found; programs which send into the classroom teachers who are woefully lacking in knowledge of methods, materials, and techniques of teaching reading are also in evidence. In-service programs that are received with gusto serve the needs and interests of teachers; others are received with much disgust because they serve no recognizable purpose. All programs, pre-service as well as in-service, should be re-invigorated; many should be re-organized; most need to be reconstituted; some may need to be replaced; and a few must be recessed.

The future of our nation rests in the hands of our teachers of reading. Upon the ability to read—to react and to fuse—ideas and ideals from the printed page rests the hope of the democratic way of life. Only through an enlightened people can the world continue to breathe the air of freedom. We can, we must, we shall prepare our children, through efficient teaching, to meet life's challenges.

Footnotes

1. Editors of Education U.S.A., "The Shape of Education for 1962-63," National School Public Relations Association (Washington, D. C., 1963).
2. John F. Travers, "Teachers Are Made—Not Born," Education, Vol. 83 (September, 1962), p. 18.
3. Mary C. Austin, "Harvard-Carnegie Study—A Preliminary Report," Challenge and Experiment in Reading, J. Allen Figurel (editor), International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Vol. 7(1963), pp. 176-8.
4. Charles H. Boehm, "A State Superintendent Comments on Some Problems in a State Reading Program," The Reading Teacher, Vol. 14 (May, 1961), pp. 319-22.
5. Mary C. Austin, et al., The Torchlighters, Tomorrow's Teachers of Reading (Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 4.
6. William S. Gray, "The Role of Teacher Education," Development in and Through Reading, National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, Part I (1961), pp. 144-61.
7. Robert Karlin, "Plans Under Way for the Improvement of Teacher Preparation," Reading in Action, International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Vol. 2 (1957,) p. 154.
8. William S. Gray, op. cit., p. 146.
9. Editors of Education U.S.A., "The Shape of Education for 1962-63," National School Public Relations Association (Washington, D. C., 1963).
10. Constance M. Burns, "How Can We Give Teachers Better Preparation for the Teaching of Reading?" Reading in Action, International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Vol. 2 (1957), pp. 151-3.
11. William S. Gray, op. cit., pp. 144-61.
12. Josephine A. Piekars, "Teacher Training for Improved Reading Instruction," Education, Vol. 81 (January, 1961), pp. 281-4.
13. Research Committee, Western Michigan University Chapter, International Reading Association, "Instructional Problems in Reading as Viewed by Teachers and Administrators," The Reading Teacher, Vol. 14 (November, 1960), pp. 75-80, 114.
14. Mary C. Austin, et al., op. cit.
15. William S. Gray, op. cit., p. 154.
16. Mary C. Austin, et al., op. cit., p. 110.
17. Ibid.
18. Nila B. Smith, "An Evaluation of Reading Instruction in American Schools," Challenge and Experiment in Reading, J. Allen Figurel (editor), International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Vol. 7 (1963), p. 183.
19. Ruth Strang, "Preparation for the Teachers of Reading," Journal of Developmental Reading, Vol. IV (Autumn, 1960), p. 55.
20. Coleman Morrison, "The Pre-service and In-service Education of Teachers of Reading," Challenge and Experiment in Reading J. Allen Figurel (editor), International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Vol. 7 (1963), p. 111.
21. op. cit., p. 154.
22. Sheldon Madeira, "Reading in Pennsylvania Schools," The Reading Teacher, Vol. 14 (May, 1961), p. 315.
23. Charles H. Boehm, op. cit., p. 321.
24. Earle W. Wiltse, "Strengths and Limitations of Pre-service Training of Teachers of Reading," New Frontiers in Reading, International Reading Association Conference Proceedings, Vol. 5 (1960), p. 54.
25. Mary C. Austin, et al., op. cit.
26. Coleman Morrison, op. cit., p. 110.
27. Robert Karlin, op. cit., p. 154-5.
28. William S. Gray, op. cit., pp. 144-61.
29. Coleman Morrison, op. cit., p. 111.
30. Ibid, p. 110.

OBJECTIVES AND EMPHASES IN COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Charles R. Colvin

Gannon College

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to review the development of different emphases in college programs in the hope that, as a result of the review, college reading workers will make greater efforts to examine their goals and objectives more critically, and perhaps change the emphases in their programs.

The observation that we in college reading need to do this goal-searching is based on an examination of the stated objectives of thirty-eight programs in Pennsylvania, an extensive reading of the literature, and the fact that college reading programs, unlike their traditionally-based history, physics, philosophy, and English course counterparts, must still convince critics of the need for their existence other than as "service" courses in the academic world.

Accordingly, the writer will discuss the evolution of certain types of programs, apply his findings in relation to the Pennsylvania programs, and offer some suggestions to implement the type of program he would like to see described more often in the literature.

From Psychologists To Psychologists

Staiger[1] has noted that the research necessary to establish reading programs came originally from the classrooms and laboratories of educational and experimental psychologists who emphasized the perceptual and mechanical aspects of the reading process. This research, when carried into the classroom, was responsible for the type of program which depended mainly on mechanical devices and which emphasized the perceptual aspects of reading. Then, ". . . without clearly understanding the values and limitations of the ideas and instruments they had borrowed, educators carried the college reading program into its second phase . . . characterized by what amounted to mass instruction."[2] This second type is what Spache calls the "skills-drills" phase because of the emphasis upon study skills and upon practice in certain types of formalized reading exercises. The last type of program seeks to identify and change behavioral patterns which are thought to be responsible for poor reading. Thus Spache observes: "It would appear that work in reading has made a complete circle away from experimental psychology, through the hands of educators and now has swung back under the aegis of those trained in dynamic psychology."[3]

Present Types Of Programs

Using Spache's analysis of trends in college programs as a base, McDonald and Byrne suggest that reading programs can be grouped—with the usual overlap—into three major phases or types, all of which show varying degrees of emphases:

1. programs which depend mainly on mechanical devices
2. skills-drills programs;
3. programs which seek to identify and change behavior patterns which are responsible for poor reading.[4]

The first type, the mechanistic approach, is concerned with the previously-mentioned perceptual and mechanical aspects of reading. Here reading is looked upon as a mechanical act in which a group of more or less discrete skills, such as rate, comprehension, and vocabulary are involved. The contention is that training in any of these aspects will bring about improvement in reading. This is the oldest of the three concepts and is generally felt to be the least acceptable.

The second type is called the "skills-drills" approach and its primary emphasis is on providing the student with extended drill on certain reading and study skills. Not only is attention given to mechanical aspects of reading, but practice is also afforded in formalized reading exercises directed at specified areas such as selecting the main ideas in paragraphs, reading for conclusions, reading for inferences, and the like. Much emphasis is usually devoted to affixes and other aspects of vocabulary and certain study skills, such as outlining, and notetaking.

The third type of program may be designated as the psychological-oriented approach. It is characterized by attempts to identify and change behavioral patterns which are thought to be responsible for poor reading. Reading difficulty is assumed to be a symptom of a greater personality problem which must be treated first. Programs giving only secondary interest to reading or study skills may be currently classified in this group. This type is judged to be the most modern concept of reading instruction.

The Types Applied

In a recent study,[5] the writer attempted to classify the thirty-eight Pennsylvania colleges that included a statement of objectives with their returned questionnaires into one of these three types of programs: (1) Type I, the mechanistic approach; (2) Type II, the skills-drills approach; and (3) Type III, the psychological-oriented approach. As Table I indicates, the majority of the Pennsylvania schools employ the skills-drills approach, although six schools are classified as using the psychological-oriented approach. Only five, or thirteen percent, use the mechanistic approach.

TABLE I

TYPES OF READING PROGRAMS IN PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGES 1957-1958

Type of Program		Number of Schools	Percent
Type I	Mechanistic	5	13.2
Type II	Skills-drills	27	71.0
Type III	Psychological-oriented	6	15.8
	TOTAL	38	100.0

Four of the forty-two schools having programs did not give a statement of objectives, and thus 9.5 percent of the schools could not be classified.

Although it was sometimes difficult to fit each school's statement of objectives or philosophy into one of the three types, closer examination of other items in the questionnaire often revealed characteristics which contributed to a final decision. It should be noted, however, that twenty-seven schools in the skills-drills category also develop the mechanical aspects of reading. Five of the six schools in the psychologically oriented pattern are among the largest institutions in the state and thus have facilities which such a comprehensive approach demands.

These are some representative write-in statements on the questionnaire demonstrating the mechanistic approach:

College students are capable of reading faster with greater comprehension. It is believed that if this is accomplished, the student will be better prepared to master his study material and get more out of his college career than he might otherwise—it is preferable to give the training to freshmen.

Guided practice in reading skills can improve the reading rate and comprehension of most adults.

Representative statements of objectives illustrating the skills-drills type of program follow:

We attempt to improve the skills necessary to read competently at a college level by giving instruction, knowledge, and experience necessary to overcome difficulties.

Our reading course is offered primarily to help students improve their college work. Thus we concentrate on better reading of college textbooks and literature and on better study habits.

Finally, some representative statements which emphasize the psychological-oriented approach are as follows:

Reading is a thought process requiring skills of organization and learning sets—attitudes included.

Improved speed of reading, comprehension, and general study habits are means to better scholarship and better living through better reading. It is a character building program, basically of which reading is a symptomatic of larger problems which also require attention.

As a result of the writer's findings on the "skills-drills" emphasis in the different programs of these thirty-eight school, and the apparent vagueness of so many of the statements, the following recommendation was made: "Course objectives should be restated in greater detail and with specific reference to the activities which constitute the reading program . . ."[6] Almost any cursory glance at programs described in the literature reveals the same difficulty in stating course objectives, a difficulty which Tiedemann and Cogan[7] attributed to teaching in general. The literature also supports the amount of emphasis on the skills-drills approach found in the Pennsylvania programs. Seven or eight of every ten programs described reflect the emphasis on the skills-building approach.

What this writer feels is more disturbing than the vague, general statements of objectives is the apparent inability of so many programs to emphasize the psychological-oriented approach. Should college reading workers be content with the first two approaches and use these as their means to establish their place in the academic world? Or is the problem one that cannot be handled on the typical college campus? If the theory of McDonald and Byrne[8] and others who hold that reading is a behavioral process and that poor reading can only be improved by changing the behavioral patterns responsible for such inadequacy is valid, then should not there be many more programs which reflect this emphasis?

Recommendations

The writer feels that the following steps can be taken to move in this direction:

1. Because the psychological-oriented approach demands the services of a clinical psychologist, an oculist, a psychiatrist, a medical doctor and other specialists in addition to the reading staff, all resources which are found only in the large multi-purpose institution, the writer suggests that two or three small colleges share community resources in an attempt to offer a program with the emphasis on the emotional-personal development of the reader. Where such arrangements are impossible, the program should be advertised as a "skills-building-we-hope-everything-will-come-out-fine" course, and not one which claims to obtain highly questionable changes in the reader.

2. Every organization concerned with college-adult reading should increase its research efforts to find out what can and cannot be done with the psychologically oriented approach. There should be special efforts to tighten statements of objectives in light of these research findings. Could we have fewer reports of "gains" in word-per-minute and percentile points because "Johnny practiced X hours per day on Y material?" Could we have objectives directly determined by the needs of the students? Perhaps the financial support for the necessary research can be found in the United States Office of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, it is apparent that college programs reflect varying emphases. Some programs may emphasize the purely visual aspects of reading, others may give attention to the theory that sheer repetition provides efficiency, and some few may hold the concept of reading as an individual personal-emotional-intellectual act. It is the writer's contention that even though the skills-drills approach is most common, steps should be taken to bring about the psychologically-oriented emphasis in more programs; first, by continuing the work being carried on in large universities; second, by a sharing of community and college resources where no large university exists; and, third, by initiating carefully designed research studies which may shed light on the ramifications inherent in the psychological approach to reading instruction at the college level. The writer feels that

college programs, built on sand in too many college campuses, can gain stature and acceptance by availing themselves of better research findings on the psychological emphasis and by tightening their statements of objectives as the result of such research.

Footnotes

1. Ralph C. Staiger, "Reading—An Innovation in the College Curriculum," **What the Colleges Are Doing in Reading Improvement Programs**, Third Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1954), p. 5.
2. George D. Spache, "Trends in College Reading Programs," **Evaluating College Reading Programs**, Fourth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference (Fort Worth, Texas: Texas Christian University Press, 1955), p. 43.
3. Ibid.
4. Arthur S. McDonald and James A. Byrne, "Four Questions on Objectives," **Journal of Developmental Reading**, I, No. 3 (Spring 1953), pp. 46-61. (An excellent analyses of the weaknesses of expressed and unexpressed objectives)
5. Charles R. Colvin, "Reading Improvement Programs in the Colleges and Universities of Pennsylvania," Unpublished Dissertation, Western Reserve University Library, Cleveland, Ohio, 1959.
6. Ibid, p. 162.
7. David V. Tiedemann and Morris Cogan, "New Horizons in Educational Research," **Phi Delta Kappan**, XXXVIII (March, 1958), pp. 236-292.
8. McDonald and Byrne, p. 48.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE READING TEST

Testing Rate Flexibility

Roderick A. Ironside

William and Mary College

Most of us value rate flexibility, even if we find it difficult to practice, and we preach the importance of flexibility to effective reading, particularly to effective wide reading. Yet it is well known that a number of problems and contradictions exist regarding rate flexibility, partly because of popular beliefs and partly because of conclusions drawn from studies with varying or conflicting objectives as well as measures. Only in the past 15 years or so, however, have these many difficulties become apparent, even though discussions and studies of the relationships between rate and difficulty, as well as between rate and comprehension, date from the early 1900's. A brief survey of the literature and a look at any speed reading class would reveal a fairly lengthy list of such difficulties, demonstrating their number and complexity.

One apparent result of the uncertainty regarding definitions, relationships, evidence of automatic rate flexibility, ideal rate flexibility and other problems is that the profession does relatively little testing and teaching of rate flexibility. If we believe that flexibiliy can be learned and is worthwhile, then certainly this result is unfortunate. On the other hand, it is fortuitous in the sense that we can more easily study and assess the relatively little that has been done in the way of formal testing.

TABLE I

Author and purpose of each test	1 Long Test; reliable, variable	2 Normal Reading situation	3 Variety in content and typographical cues	4 Minimum length, 400 words	5 Stated purpose for each reading	6 One purpose across several difficulty levels	7 Clear difficulty levels	8 Several Readings several levels	9 Timed separately	10 Frust. level	11 Rate of Comprehension	12 Flex. index	13 Ironside Total Comp. score	14 Question Analysis
McDonald et al(1C)* 6th gr.-adult a	no	yes	Con.-some Cues-some	yes 3 articl	yes	no	no info.	no	yes yes	no	poss.	yes	no	no
Letson (9) college a,b	no	yes	Con.-yes Cues-some	yes 4 articl	yes	yes across 2	yes	no	yes no	no	poss.	yes	poss.	no
Braam,Sheldon (3) college c	YES; not variable	yes	Con.-yes Cues-no	yes 5 articl	yes	yes 5 implied	no info.	no	yes no	no	poss.	yes	poss.	no
Gilbert (6) d college														
Paragraphs	yes; not variable	yes	Con.-some Cues-no	no	yes	no	no info.	no	no no	no	no	no	no	no
Articles	no	yes	Con.-some Cues-no	yes 2 articl	yes	yes 2 implied	no info.	no	yes no	no	poss.	no	poss.	no
Columbia (5) adult b	no	yes	Con.-yes Cues-no	yes 3 articl	yes	yes across 3	no info.	no	yes no	no	poss.	no	poss.	no
Smith et al (13) college a	no	1/2	Con.-yes Cues-yes	no	vague	no	no info.	no	no yes	no	no	yes	no	no
Moe (11) college b	yes; not variable	yes	Con.-some Cues-no	yes;4 of 6 articl	implied	yes across 6	yes	no	yes ?	no	poss.	yes	poss.	no
Ironside (8) secondary b	no	yes	Con.-some Cues-some	yes 2 articl	yes	yes across 2	no info.	no	yes yes	no	poss.	yes	poss.	no
Robinson,Hall (12) college c	yes; not variable	yes	Con.-yes Cues-yes	yes 5 articl	yes	yes 4 implied	no info.	no	yes no	no	poss.	yes	poss.	no
Berg,Spache (2) business a	no	yes	Con.-no Cues-yes	yes	yes	no	no info.	no	yes no	no	no	yes	no	no
Greene (7) a college; study	no	yes	Con.-no Cues- ?	yes 4 articl	yes	no	no info.	no	no no	no	no	no	no	no
Anderson (1) b college; study	no	no	Con.-yes Cues-no	no	yes	yes across 3	no info.	no	yes yes	no	no	no	no	no
Carlson (4) a elementary; study	no	yes	Con.-some Cues-no	no	yes	no	no info.	no	yes yes	no	no	no	no	no

Notes: "Typographical Cues" refers to numbered lists, footnotes, quotation marks, digits, headings, spacing, etc. Column 3.

"Poss." (possible) refers to measures which are feasible, but which author(s) did not do or suggest. Columns 11, 13.

"Content" refers to breadth: narrative, history, human-interest, technical, etc. Column 3.

*See "Bibliography for Measures Studied" for full references for the 15 tests entered in Table I.

Notes: a Measures rate with varied purposes
b Measures rate with varied difficulties
c Measure rate with varied content (implied varied difficulties)
d Measures comprehension with varied purposes, within overall time limit

In 1952, Sheldon and Carillo[1], discussing the relationship of speed to comprehension, emphasized two problems: a) the fact that so often a single measured rate was assumed to be a true rate, and b) the temptation to assume that increased rate would result in greater comprehension at all difficulty levels and for various purposes. They stated that at that time there was no standardized test of flexibility in rate and proposed several criteria for such a test which would take various levels of difficulty into account. They indicated that their suggestions were offered as an attempt to encourage the construction of a good test and that they were not certain that they had included all the necessary variables in their proposal.

While Sheldon and Carillo did not presume to state absolute criteria, their suggestions nevertheless give us a starting point in examining a number of tests (standardized or not) which purport to measure rate flexibility. For ease in analysis, their 6-point list was expanded into the fourteen items shown in Table I, and a number of rate flexibility tests (described in the literature, published separately, or included in diagnostic surveys) were matched against these criteria. Principally through the use of YES and NO, Table I indicates the extent to which individual measures correspond to the Sheldon-Carillo proposal. Admittedly, certain of the items are difficult to define and have been assessed subjectively (e.g., columns 1 and 3), while many other items are susceptible to objective assessment. Where necessary, explanations or qualifications have been included in the table; the Notes amplify certain of the items used. In addition, it should be noted that three studies from the 1930's and 1940's have been included, in order to give historical perspective and to provide a sample of rate flexibility tests which were prepared for the purposes of particular studies dealing with rate and comprehension.

(Table Page 27)

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the study of the Sheldon-Carillo criteria, the study of the various tests, and the related discussion.

1. Of the 13 tests examined, none meets the criteria as set forth by Sheldon and Carillo. There are a number of reasons implicit in the discussion which help to explain this conclusion. Another consideration is that for the sake of feasibility, tests must remain relatively short.
2. It is possible to combine certain features of several tests in order to set up a hypothetical test which would better satisfy the criteria.
   a) Letson: 2 difficulties across one purpose; 2 purposes across one level of difficulty
   b) Moe: a wide range of difficulty levels
   c) Robinson and Hall; Braam and Sheldon: several subject areas
   d) McDonald: flexibility ratio (avoids specific rate figures)
   e) McDonald: various purposes

3. In view of the nature of the tests studied, and to the extent that these tests comprise a valid criterion, the original Sheldon-Carillo criteria omit the item "several purposes at one difficulty level".
4. A comprehensive flexibility test for rate alone is still needed.
5. The tests studied are quite different in important ways: variety of content, number of articles, length of articles, whether actual purposes are stated, number of difficulty levels, number of purposes, design for interrelating purposes and difficulties, whether a flexibility score is rendered.
6. Flexibility scores of the tests are not comparable, since content, purposes, length, and levels of difficulty all differ.
7. We are not justified in using the proposed criteria as a means of judging the value of these or any other rate flexibility tests, since there is no assurance that the criteria are themselves valid or comprehensive, although of course they appear to be.
8. There is an apparent common assumption that reading flexibility refers to or is limited to rate flexibility, and that rate is an adequate measure of total reading flexibility.
9. Reading flexibility refers to more than rate alone, and probably "flexibility of approach" is fundamentally more important than flexibility in rate; although rate may be an easy-to-find evidence of reading flexibility or flexibility of approach.
10. It is apparently difficult to measure other aspects of reading flexibility than rate.
11. It is difficult to categorize rate flexibility variables. How many rates are there or should there be? How many purposes are definable or separable? What are the components of difficulty?
12. There remain a number of problems regarding the testing of rate flexibility. Specific problems pointed up by this analysis, and not referred to earlier, are these:
    a) Standards of desirable rate flexibility scores or indexes;
    b)possibility of flexible rate in the reading of one selection, with or without the same apparent purpose;
    c) expected variations in amount of rate flexibility, by age, grade, experience;
    d) assurance that a test evokes flexible rates, whether or not the reader already possesses rate flexibility to a degree.

Footnotes

1. William D. Sheldon and Lawrence W. Carillo, "The Flexibility of Reading Rate", in Journal of Educational Psychology 43 (May 1952), p. 299.
2. Ibid.

Bibliography For Measures Studied

1. Irving Anderson, "Studies in the Psychology of Reading", in Psychological Monographs, 48 (1937), pp. 1-36.
2. Paul C. Berg and George D. Spache, Test of Reading Flexibility, University of Florida (Gainesville 1956).
3. Leonard Braam and William Sheldon, Developing Efficient Reading, (New York 1950).
4. Thorsten Carlson, "The Relationship Between Speed and Accuracy of Comprehension", in Journal of Educational Research, 42 (1949) pp. 500-512.
5. Columbia University Study Program in Rapid Reading with Improved Retention, (Book-of-the-Month-Club project) (New York 1961).

6. Doris W. Gilbert, **Breaking the Reading Barrier**, (Englewood Cliffs 1959).
7. Edward B. Green, "Effectiveness of Various Rates of Silent Reading of College Students", in **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 15 (1931) pp. 214-227.
8. Roderick A. Ironside, unpublished diagnostic tool, 1958.
9. Charles Letson, "Speed and Comprehension in Reading", in **Journal of Educational Research**, 52 (1958) pp. 49-53.
10. Arthur S. McDonald **et al**, **Reading Versatility Test** (Basic and Advanced), Huntington 1962).
11. Iver L. Moe, "Reading Patterns of College Students", paper read at 12th annual conference National Reading Conference, Charlottesville, Va., 1962.
12. Francis P. Robinson and Prudence Hall, Robinson-Hall Reading Tests, (Columbus 1949).
13. Donald E. P. Smith **et al**, **Learning to Learn** (New York 1961).

MOTIVATION AND READING

Gerald G. Glass

Adelphi College

This paper is concerned primarily with motivation as a factor in improvement of reading. The literature on "motivation" is extensive. The term is indexed in almost every psychology text.[1] Its nature and control are an integral part of most, if not all, theories of behavior and personality. Motivation is defined and discussed in English and English[2] as "the general name of the fact that an organism's acts are partly determined in direction and strength by its own nature . . . process that energizes differentially certain responses, thus making them dominant over other possible responses to the same situation." For us it is: that variable which places the student higher or lower on the continuum of incentive to do something to improve his reading rather than not, and to read rather than not read. (Implied is that a student may be "motivated" not to read or not to improve in reading.) He may be motivated to do something else, usually (or sometimes) at the expense of his academic and personal growth.[3]

Smith and Dechant[4] discuss motivation as it particularly relates to our topic. They suggest that human motives may fall into three categories—physiological, psychological, and habit. The physiological aspect is seen as being the basic drives such as hunger, thirst, sex, and the like. "Physical defects such as bad vision, poor hearing, endocrine disturbances, malnutrition, or illness of any kind" may affect negatively motivation to read and work to improve. In my own experience, both as a student and as a practitioner in the field of reading, there have been few cases, if any, of reading difficulty and lack of motivation in which I felt physiological factors were of a significant contributory nature. I am cognizant of the interesting and recent work of Smith and Corrigan at Michigan State, Dellacoto in Pennsylvania, and the contributions of the optometric profession. To date, I have been able to apply little from their writings to help me teach reading. Perhaps, as some of my colleagues in medicine, neurology, and optometry imply, it is because I do not fully understand each that I cannot use their contributions. This may be so.

Psychological aspects of motivation, I feel, have more to contribute to the reading specialist. Reading can be seen by the student as affecting his psychological needs. "It attracts the individual. The task itself appeals; it challenges the individual; it upsets his mental equilibrium; it creates an anxiety that prompts him to give his attention . . . self esteem, self realization, curiosity, security and a need to be adequate, successful, and to belong are the motives that most commonly energize human behavior."[5] Smith and Dechant introduce the interesting concept that "habit" in itself may become a motivator although the habit may have been acquired in order to satisfy needs other than reading itself. "A child learns to read because he is motivated by basic personal needs. But gradually, as he becomes skilled in reading, reading acquires a motivating force of its own."[6] When a student is a skilled reader, this skill may be a primary factor in his voluntarily turning toward reading as something that is self-satisfying. In this fortunate situation we need only to help him in the selection of good materials.

As you would expect, there is much in the psychoanalytic literature which deals with the problem of motivation in school practices. Discussions of unconscious motivation and sublimation of libidinal energies abound. To refer to only a few: Pearson[7] suggests that a child's problem of growing out of the sole acceptance of a **pleasure principle** (moving toward anything giving pleasure and away from anything giving pain) into a maturing acceptance of the **reality principle** (accepting the realities of society and of delayed gratification) is a possible crucial factor in lack of interest in reading, particularly in the academic areas. In this excellent article on learning difficulties from a psychoanalytic point of view, Pearson is concerned with "love" as a motivator (p. 328). "The reward which is most gratifying to the child is that of love from (the teacher). When the child loves the teacher, he will do anything to please him—even learn the most uninteresting subject—but he anticipates a real expression of love from the teacher in return . . . (if he dislikes the teacher) he will refuse to learn even a subject that is somewhat interesting in itself." Pearson discusses (p. 346) the case of a girl of twelve who disliked reading and would not read. He describes a situation of extreme sibling rivalry where her older sister happened to be very interested and able in reading. As a reaction to the envied and hated sister she "proceeded to select areas of endeavor in which there was no chance of her sister stealing from her the admiration and love she craved." Result: no reading! It is implied that unconscious forces may be operating to undermine almost anything a teacher can do to motivate toward reading improvement.

Phyliss Blanchard[8] in her informative article on reading and personality suggests that an anti-motivator may be a dislike for reading because reading content may become associated with emotional conflicts. She discusses (p. 184) neurotic tendencies toward avoidance. "Reading may represent a hidden antagonism to adults expressed in passive resistance rather than in open rebellious behavior . . . the failure may result from a wish to avoid reading because it has previously stirred up feelings of guilt or anxiety."

Liss[9] suggests that emotional factors may either foster or retard a student's use of reading as a learning tool. "Rejection of the educator (p. 104) frequently is a carry-over of previous unfortunate experiences with adults in the family and sometimes siblings. This personal component in learning may account for the fact that some individuals are better able to learn from persons than from books and vice versa."

To me the contributions of the psychoanalytic field to our topic are often informative yet frustrating. They do give a basis from which teachers may interpret and affect behavior as it relates to reading. We should, as much as our own personal growth and training as teachers allow, try to utilize an understanding of unconscious motivation when we decide how we will motivate for more and better reading. But actually the use of psychoanalytic data often seems too esoteric for the non-psychologist teacher. That behavior is often caused by covert factors, I agree. However, to determine accurately these factors and to get into that therapeutic relationship with the student in order to do something about it, is, as many of us have found, unrealistic. Perhaps a recent experience I had will demonstrate how "way out" some psychoanalytic recommendations may be to the teacher. I was on a panel whose charge was to discuss emotional difficulties and reading. The psychologist suggested that in 1st and 2nd grade youngsters are concerned with the Oedipal problem and that teachers should know what this may mean to the child. Then he actually advised us that the only effective way to deal with the problem would be to make sure we had resolved our own Oedipal problem and, if not, to do something about it! Needless to say the audience (and the panel) responded with unconscious denial, aggression, voyeurism, and the like.

At the Adelphi College Reading and Study Center we see up to 200 grade school students a year as reading problem referrals. Each student, in addition to the reading evaluation, receives at least a WISC, Bender-Gestalt and Draw-a-Person. In addition most of these students are given the T.A.T. and Rorschach. The percentage of psychological reports which suggest that emotional difficulties are present and possibly a major causal factor is extremely high—between 80 and 90%. However, little is actually known, as far as I have been able to discover, whether reading disability is more a symptom of emotional problems or whether emotional problems are a resultant symptom of reading disability. In recent years I have come to believe that the latter is more common. I feel that appropriate reading instruction given in the first and second grade would teach many more of these children to read and thus reduce significantly the number of emotional problems reported in school age children and the resultant anxiety and rejection generated in the home. Success in learning to read can actually undermine the growth of many "emotional problems" which may need a failure experience as the catalyst for their manisfestation.

Keeping failure from the student, or giving him the proverbial success experiences, is a crucial factor in motivating towards reading. "Success is one of the most potent of motivators. Not only is success important in be-

ginning reading, it is a primary condition for establishing positive motivation in dealing with reading difficulties. The child who has behind him nothing but a record of failure can hardly be expected to respond even to the most stimulating response."[10]

Everything should be done to affect the reading environment of the student so that he is able to "read" *with the skill he does possess. Everything* should be done to affect the mental set of the student to insure that he feels what he is doing is considered of immediate value.

Feelings of success and failure are not dependent upon actual achievement but, rather, are determined by the goals, desires, expectations, and, aspirations of the person at the time of action. These expectations, or levels of aspiration, then, are seen as crucial in feelings of success. If they are too high—frustration; too low—stagnation and boredom.

This phenomenon takes on more significance when we realize that level-of-aspiration is crucially affected by previous success experiences.

The complex area of developing competency in reading is another crucial aspect in motivation that teachers can do something about. The more competent one is in any endeavor, the more likely one is to either work or play in that area. The fact that competency in itself is a motivator may be overlooked. For close to a half century skilled educators have developed an impressive body of knowledge concerned with the teaching of reading skills. The text books on reading and the manuals to the series of basal readers are, on the whole, excellent testimonial to the sophistication that "reading methods" have achieved. My colleagues in the other specialties in education and neophyte teachers are always surprised "how much more there is to reading" than they had thought. However, we cannot look away from a fact that hits us right square in the classroom. Why are we not availing ourselves of this body of knowledge? There are too many children not being given good developmental training in reading. Many of our teachers are dealing with problems of class size, budget, environment, and personal inadequacies due to training and personality. We have built-in motivators when we teach students the basic skills in reading. It may be wasteful to seek other less discernible and vulnerable determinants of motivation if the youngster simply does not like reading because he cannot benefit enough from his reading.

Teachers cannot be solely concerned with motivation as a factor in influencing students to read. They also have a major responsibility in motivating the weak students to do something about their difficulties. Here the motivators are potentially less dynamic and immediate in effect. The poor reader needs to become interested in his own improvement and not only in his immediate interests. He must understand that lack of achievement in reading is not only undesirable but something that he has the ability to overcome.

In this area the student's perception of a teacher as a competent helper and not an evaluator is extremely important. What is needed is a close supportive relationship in which the teacher truly accepts the student's

recurring reading difficulties as evidence that she is needed as a teacher and can thus gain some of her own fulfillment. Honestly expressed statements like "look at it again"; "I'll help you", can go a long way in helping the student apply himself even when the material becomes difficult.

Arthur Gates states that the major problem of the teacher is one of motivation.[11] Motivation is most frequently associated with the interest factor, that what is interesting will motivate. However, I have tried to demonstrate that attitudes relating to competency as well as psychological factors must also be investigated. It was not the purpose of this paper to give "methods" of motivation. My boundaries included more of the rationale and the conditions that might be considered in developing reading programs consistent with motivational aspects of reading improvement. However, we might examine a few of the ways in which we deal with this one factor, interest.

Are we doing what we can to motivate for interest? Obviously not, if we read the material supplied to us by Norwell. He reports on a 12 year study of children's interests and what the high schools are doing to satisfy these interests.[12] I recommend it to English teachers and librarians in the high schools. Dr. Norwell, after examining countless materials, concluded that most of the material in the high school is either too difficult, too subtle, or too sophisticated to permit its enjoyment by the majority of secondary school students.

Reading to find out what you want to know because you are involved in a pursuit of real interest leaves more positive feeling for reading than reading because you are supposed to. In a classroom where youngsters are working to find answers to the countless questions they might be asking concerning man, his history, and his environment, reading will be an important tool. Students here read because reading is needed to satisfy and extend their interest of the day. How else might you know enough to take a stand, be on a panel, report to the class?

Reading, then, is a way of finding out more about what is of interest. Doris Gates, the children's author, concerned that the interest motive may, with certain practices, be undermined, admonishes us: "to offer rewards for the largest number of books read is to make a mockery of all that literature is, and in the end, will defeat the purpose for which the rewards were established . . . Let children understand from the beginning that it is not the number of books you have read that determines how well read you are; it is the number of good books you remember."[13]

I know that all of us could list much that might be done to explore the psychogenic assumption that one will be motivated to do what he sees as offering success, satisfaction, acceptance, and esteem. Such a list might include:

1. the material should offer chance of success as defined by the teacher
2. the student should be skilled enough to achieve success without too much demand upon his "capacities"
3. the environment should be such that students are allowed to grow and improve by overtly exposing ignorance

4. attempt to offer reading materials which have a good chance of being interesting materials
5. realize the "psychological" state and needs of the youngsters
6. learn as much as we can about improving reading skills.

Footnotes

1. C. Hall & G. Lindsey, **Theories of Personality**, John Wiley & Sons (New York, 1957)
2. H. English, A. English, **A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms**, Longmans, Green & Co., (New York 1958), p. 330.
3. Bruno Bettleheim, "Roadblocks to Learning" in **NEA Journal** (March, 1963) p. 25.
4. H. Smith, E. Dechant, **Psychology in Teaching Reading**, Prentice-Hall, Inc. (New Jersey, 1961), pp. 270-272.
5. **Ibid.**, p. 271.
6. **Ibid.**, p. 272.
7. G. Pearson, " **A Survey of Learning Difficulties in Children**", **The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, V11**, pp. 322-386.
8. P. Blanchard, "Reading Disabilities", same as 7, Vol. 11, pp. 163-187.
9. Edward Liss, "Motivations in Learning", same as 7, Vol. X, pp. 100-116.
10. A. Gates, F. Jennings, "The Role of Motivation", **NSSE 16th Yearbook**, Part 1, p. 113.
11. A. Gates, **op. cit.**, p. 111.
12. G. W. Norwell, "Some Results of a Twelve-Year Study of Childrens' Reading Interests", **English Journal**, 35 (D'46), pp. 537-546.
13. D. Gates, "The Librarian's Responsibility for Developing and Maintaining Reading Interests", **Supplementary Educational Monographs**, No. 84, (1956), The University of Chicago Press, (p. 165).

PROBLEMS IN READING RESEARCH

Leonard S. Braam

Syracuse University

In most instances initial consideration of the subject of problems in reading research undoubtedly stimulates thinking in respect to the numerous questions and problems about which greater information is needed. There are many such problems which need more careful exploration in order to provide better understandings to serve as guides to more effective teaching and learning. Or, consideration of this general topic might also logically lead to examining problems related to questions concerning research design and statistical treatment and analysis of data accumulated. While these are of extreme importance and should not be under-rated, there is still another area of problems in this matter of research which needs, but to date does not seem to have been given, sufficient, systematic, and careful thought.

But before considering problems in this area, let us digress for a moment to consider four, not unrelated, items which, generally speaking, are not problems in carrying out research in reading.

One of these is ideas. For the most part there is no dearth of ideas. If anything, they are sometimes too numerous. (In fact, this may, in a sense, contradict the contention that ideas do not present a problem area.) They may, in some instances, present a problem merely because of their quantity, but generally speaking this is not the case.

During the course of a conference such as this, the air is filled with ideas. Unless participants are extremely passive, they will probably hear, share, and have more ideas than could be explored in the next ten years. True, some of these may not be so good or so fruitful as others. But then, it's a little like panning for gold. It is frequently necessary to do a great deal of screening and sifting to get those few valuable nuggets. Someone has said that ideas must be treated like baby fish. Throw thousands of them into the water. Only a handful may survive, but that is plenty.

Ideas beget ideas, particularly when they are shared. There is little profit in exchanging dollar bills with someone. When the transaction is completed, each individual still will not have increased his dollar holdings. But if two individuals each exchange an idea, the net result is that each then has a minimum of two ideas. And, in all probability, the process of sharing two ideas will result in the generation of still more ideas, and so the stimulating process of developing ideas goes on. But let us leave this momentarily with the statement repeated that, by and large, one of our problems in reading research is not that of a dearth of ideas.

A second problem which does not need to exist is that of money. (Obviously, this is not in reference to personal budgets!) Listed in **The Foundations Directory** prepared by the Foundations Library Center of New York City in 1960 are some 5,000 foundations, each possessing assets of $50,000 or more which made grants of at least $10,000 during their latest year of record. This directory does not include nearly 7,000 "very small" foundations of lesser assets and making smaller grants. Some $3.5 million of these grants were made to educational research projects. This, incidentally, was only 2% of the educational grants. It is therefore apparent that financial support is available for conducting good research projects.

A third non-existent problem is availability of subjects. According to the 1962 **Statistical Abstracts of the United States**[1] there were during 1961 a total of approximately 3½ million individuals between the ages of 18 and 24 in our American colleges. There is, therefore, a virtually unlimited supply of subjects representing, if you will, all sizes, shapes, and colors.

And fourthly, there is no problem in respect to interest in research. There are degrees of interest to be sure, but basically all educators worth their salt are, or should be, interested in research whether they participate actively in its implementation or are affected by its findings in their thinking, planning, and the execution of their jobs. Thus, it is submitted that the availability of ideas, financial support, subjects, and interest, while they may be related to problems in reading research, need not represent serious problems in themselves.

What then are the types of existing problems alluded to earlier? There are four which seem to this observer to present an unnecessary curtailing and restricting force on extensive and effective research in the field of reading.

One problem is that of extreme restrictive samples from which can be drawn but limited and often tenuous conclusions. The concern here is

not so much with the small sample per se Statistical methods are available which can deal with this problem. Of greater concern are the limitations arising from the restricted populations which such samples represent. For example, descriptive data may be accumulated from a sample of students from one institution which might be representative of students attending that particular institution. But to generalize from these data beyond that population to students in general is often difficult to justify. Likewise, conclusions resulting from a study concerning procedures or methodology can be interpreted only within the relatively limited frame of reference of the institution at which it is conducted. If these same data could be accumulated or this same study conducted at several institutions in various parts of the country, the resulting findings, whether supporting or contradicting each other, would be far more meaningful and significant. In other words, although there is a tremendously large potential population of subjects, to date the means have not been designed whereby an adequate sampling of that population will permit the drawing of more than very limited conclusions.

A second problem mitigating against extensive and effective research in reading is the present taboo against replication. This restriction undoubtedly stems in large part from the concept that all graduate research done as part of advanced degree requirements should concern itself with something new and must make a new contribution to the existing body of research-based knowledge. While there is much merit in this concept, there is also an obviously great danger in basing conclusions and future operating premises on the results of one investigation only. Whether results are significant or not, and regardless of the population represented by the sample investigated, there seems to be a general attitude that, since this problem has now been "researched", attention can be directed toward a new problem. Very little, if any, what we might call "verifying research" is carried out.

A good book, if it is worth reading once, is probably worth reading a second, and perhaps even a third time at some later date with a slightly new perspective. So, too, with a good research problem. If it is a sufficiently valid and important problem to warrant expenditure of time, effort, and money exploring its relation to one sample in one specific situation, then it should be of sufficient signifcance and importance to examine in greater scope and depth. Considering the limited frame of reference within which most educational research is conducted, it is suggested that the majority of even the best planned and conducted research projects might well be looked upon in a sense as "pilot studies" leading to replicated investigations with new samples representing different populations under different circumstances and influences. If findings from an original investigation are substantiated on the basis of replication, it can conclude with some degree of certainty that a fairly firm base has been established on which to operate. If findings differ, it is obvious that the drawing of firm conclusions must be delayed until further evidence can be accumulated.

A third most serious problem in reading research is the lack of adequate communications. Despite numerous annual reading conferences at which representatives from many states gather, frequent, relatively local, professional gatherings, and many professional publications, most individuals in the field of reading tend to operate in relative degrees of isolation. Referring again to the matter of ideas, it is the unusually rare and gifted individual whose ideas cannot be stimulated, broadened, and clarified through interaction with others. In many instances this isolation is imposed by external situations, geographic isolation, for example, which are beyond the individual's immediate control. In other instances, however, this appears to be an almost self-imposed isolation predicated on the fear or supposition that someone else may profit, or "steal the show", or take advantage of ideas or projects which an individual feels belong solely to him. It is unfortunate, for example, when two competent individuals from closely allied areas from the same institution independently submit large research proposals which are directed at the same population to explore very similar questions. Each may have much merit. With more adequate communication, indeed with communication, and a sharing of ideas these might be combined to form a stronger, better, more comprehensive and thorough investigation. Or each could be strengthened to be a better study in itself.

A fourth problem which some investigators have attempted to resolve is that of follow-up. More planned and systematically periodic longitudinal studies in the field of reading research are needed. Greater continuity of observation and data accumulated over a longer period of time would add measurably to the body of research-based knowledge.

There may well be other curtailing and restrictive forces mitigating against more extensive and effective research in the field of reading, but these four—restrictive sampling, insufficient replication, inadequate communication, and insufficient follow-up—appear from this author's perspective at present to head the list. Perhaps in the final analysis this leads to one major question or problem. How can these problems best be resolved?

It is here where it would appear that an organization such as the CRA may be an effective agency to provide ideas and, hopefully, leadership to assist in at least the partial resolution of these limitations. One approach might be the establishing of a committee responsible for stimulating, evaluating, and encouraging cooperative research projects.

Following are a few brief suggestions which might serve as a point of departure in considering possible functions of such a committee.

1. Develop and maintain a file of CRA members and institutions interested in participating in the exploration of particular problems.

2. Accumulate and maintain information about institutions interested in cooperative research regarding such items as problems of particular interest, number and kind of students, and availability of general research facilities available (i. e. computer systems).

3. Solicit, receive, evaluate and categorize research suggestions and proposals from CRA members.

4. Select research proposals appropriate for cooperative research and distribute these for consideration by individuals who, according to committee files, have indicated interest in the particular problem, or whose institutions appear to be appropriate for such a study.

5. Develop and maintain a file of information concerning foundations interested in particular types of research.

6. Submit, or serve in advisory capacity for submission of, applications for foundation aid in conducting research projects.

7. Plan and conduct an annual research "seminar" at which cooperative research projects for the year would be presented, explained, discussed, and final design drafted.

8. Edit and publish an annual summary report of cooperative research.

Some ideas have been presented here which, it is hoped, will serve to stimulate additional ideas. It has not been the purpose or intent of the author to enumerate all existing problems in reading research or to provide definitive means of solution of those problems mentioned. Rather, the intent has been to provide a few ideas which may serve as a point of departure from which to move toward eventual resolution of these limitations and restrictions. Whether or not the specific ideas suggested here prove to be the pattern ultimately followed in resolving these problems is not considered of major importance. Of far greater concern is that a hard, serious look be taken at what can be done to make research in reading more effective, efficient, and meaningful.

Footnotes

1 U.S. Bureau of the Census, **Statistical Abstracts of the United States: 1962** (Eighty-third edition, Washington, D. C., 1962.)

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES ON COLLEGE STUDENTS' STUDY HABITS AND ATTITUDES

Margaret M. Bott

University of Maryland

Perception is known to be a highly individual process in which inner needs and motives play a part. On the college campus a variety of persons perceive students and make important administrative decisions on the basis of their judgments. Professors, for example, observe classroom performance and estimate student responsiveness as apathetic or enthusiastic. Counselors respond to motivational cues and personality functioning and view students as mentally healthy or vocationally mature. Deans and administrators use their own distinctive indices and each of the professionals relates to students with the conviction that he knows what they are really like.

From time to time a discovery of misperception occurs. For example, the chemistry professor may assume a borderline student will seek him out and ask for help. But such a student may have failed the course before acknowledging that the professor was the resource furthest from his mind. Similarily we design reading and study skills programs on common assumptions about our clientele. We expect them, somehow, to identify their need or to follow the recommendation of advisers about it. We assume they are informed of the availability of our service. We also require them to adapt to predetermined conditions as to where, when and how help may be obtained.

To test the validity of these latter perceptions at the University of Maryland we have recently attempted to learn about study problems from the students' frame of reference. We asked a selected number of students to describe the academic environment for us. The results were to supply guidelines for planning new ways to improve the academic functioning of our students.

Background of Study

Initiated in the fall of 1962, the study had a three-fold purpose: (1) to survey student perceptions of study problems, (2) to compare the climate for study in the residential units, (3) to assess student readiness for training as residential study skill consultants.

The sample selected was composed of scholarship chairmen, those students elected in the living units to promote scholarship among the members. It was assumed that students so identified would be cognizant of study attitudes and problems within their group.

Why residential units? These were selected for two reasons. They furnish the setting for the greatest frequency of student-to-student contacts. Since we wanted to sample those contacts related to study, it was appropriate to look in places where maximal contacts occur. Secondly, the research of social scientists has emphasized the impact of peer groups on student behavior,[1] particularly as related to attitude formation. Since the group furnishes support and a sense of belonging, it also provides cues about other things, such as scholarship. These meanings are all important to the student, since he needs the rewards the group can supply and would suffer by its rejection. One purpose of this survey was to sample the various group impressions as they relate to study problems.

Results of Survey

Questionnaires addressed to scholarship chairmen were returned from eighteen sororities (representing 100%), thirteen women's residence halls (92%), seventeen fraternities (73%) and forty men's residence halls (82%). Total number of groups sampled was 88.

Questionnaire Items

The questionnaire was composed of twelve items dealing with three main categories: (a) study problems observed in the living units; (b) study

facilities in the units, and (c) attitudes of scholarship chairmen toward reading and study skills assistance. Results will be discussed in relation to each of the three content areas.

A. **Observed study problems.** The purpose of the first item was to appraise the extent to which study problems are relevant within the total context of student concerns. The criterion of relevancy was a rating of how frequently students discuss such problems with one another. Using the results of a 6-point rating scale, we were able to conclude that study problems are indeed relevant concerns talked about by students at Maryland.

According to the respondents, students who live together in sororities verbalize such problems several times a day, whereas in women's dormitories they are heard about once a day. In the current sample females observed study problems more frequently than males who reportedly discuss study problems several times a week both in fraternity and residence halls.

Scholarship chairmen were asked to identify sources to which students turned for help with their problems. There was more than 80% agreement that other students are the primary source of help. Instructors were viewed as helpers by 19% of the sample, laboratory assistants, by 9%, resident advisers, by 4% and the Counseling Center by 1%. It appears that students do not necessarily seek help from the traditional sources planned by University faculty and personnel specialists.

How is the student with problems characterized by scholarship chairmen? Those in sororities perceive problems in relation to grades and academic requirements. Two other sources of problems reported were excessive dating, and parental pressure for achievement. Women in residence halls also described the struggle for academic status among their members.

Among the male groups similar difficulties were described as well as problems of motivation. For example, fraternity scholarship chairmen identified: "freshmen who lack confidence due to poor study habits in high school", " students with other than academic problems," " students with low motivation and no vocational goal." Men's residence halls included a diversity of problems including "students on probation", "freshmen having difficulties adapting to college".

Comparing these results, one finds that females restrict study problems to their academic context, whereas males are more aware of the impact of motivation and attitudes on the problems they observe. Males referred to vocational goals more frequently than females. This trend is consistent with other studies in which men have been found to attend college for vocational preparation in contrast to women's more personal goals.[2]

When assessing the general attitudes of the group toward academic achievement, the sororities self ratings were very positive and those of women's residence only average. Males of both groups ranged between very positive and average with fraternities expressing slightly more positive attitudes than men's residence halls. Sororities attained the highest overall grade point average (2.52) followed by female dormitory residents (2.26),

fraternities (2.14) and male dormitory residents (1.96). This suggests that scholarship chairmen were accurate in appraising the academic climates of their respective groups.

In identifying kinds of problems, respondents in each group agreed that the predominant problem is inability to budget time. There was also consensus about other pertinent concerns: lack of interest, failure to understand assignments, reading difficulties. Approximately 10% of the sample were concerned about use of the library, spelling and vocabulary.

B. **Facilities for Study.** In the survey 90% of the scholarship chairmen from sorority, fraternity and women's halls described designated places for study in their units. This contrasted with men's halls, among which 50% reported study areas. Use of these facilities appeared highest in sororities and least in men's residence halls. The dormitory groups were surpassed by the Greeks in providing study aids, reference materials and tutorial services. The nature of these social organizations obviously puts them in a more favorable position than dormitories for providing services.

C. **Attitude of Scholarship Chairmen toward Reading and Study Skills Assistance.** Among University of Maryland scholarship chairmen the RSSL was better known among males than females. Fraternities were best acquainted with the facilities and sororities least so. Residential students of both sexes were somewhat familiar with the services, probably as a result of the training program which informs dormitory counselors about the Lab.

Scholarship chairmen were asked to estimate the interest of undergraduates for training as study consultants within their groups. Women dormitory residents were the most responsive; both men's groups were slightly positive; sororities were not interested. The groups differed in their attitudes toward student's responsibility for helping other students. Women in residence halls favored this idea and observed "one can learn easier from someone closer to one's age and experience."

Women in sororities, on the other hand, wanted to continue the RSSL type of assistance but were not willing to be trained themselves. There was divided opinion as to the value of study helps for all students vs. restriction to pledge classes. A compulsory basis for participation was urged. "The program would help if the students were persuaded to take the first step." "Unless it were required, students say they have no time."

Male residence hall respondents used this item to react to the University in general. They rejected personal interest in receiving study skills training and preferred existing facilities such as the use of Counseling Center, or speakers assigned to dormitories. Fraternities were evenly divided in their attitudes. About half observed the need for study help and were willing to undergo training. Others predicted poor perserverance in a group program and preferred to send students individually to the RSSL.

Follow-up: We concluded from this brief survey of scholarship chairmen that environmental influences were indeed important. In order to affect the academic environment more directly, we acted upon several of the results of the survey. For example, about a third of the scholarship chair-

men did not know about RSSL facilities. An open-house was conducted for them and the response of attendance and interest was very positive. From this contact a small group were identified who were interested in formal training to help them deal with study problems in their living units. These study consultants attended two training sessions and worked through the Study Skills program themselves. They were invited to maintain a consulting relationship with RSSL staff.

The survey results also suggested that Greeks would welcome help for their pledge classes. We therefore scheduled small meetings for pledge trainers from sororities and fraternities, and discussed study attitudes of the individual houses and particularly of pledge classes. Specific plans for the fall include testing of entire pledge classes for several groups and training of designated leaders to conduct study skills session with their own pledges.

References

1. Newcomb, Theodore M., "Student Peer-Group Influence and Intellectual Outcomes of College Experience", Personality Factors on the College Campus (University of Texas, 1962) 69-81.
2. Douvan, Elizabeth and Kay, Carol, "Motivational Factors in College Entrance", The American College (Wiley and Sons, 1962) 199-224.

ACHIEVING FACULTY SUPPORT FOR COLLEGE READING PROGRAMS

Arthur W. Heilman

Pennsylvania State University

Achieving university wide support for reading improvement programs is a problem of considerable importance. Any serious discussion of this topic would, of necessity, have to deal with a number of issues such as:

1. Articulation between the reading program and the general faculty.
2. The avenues of communication that have been established and kept open between the reading program and the administration and faculty.
3. The type of reading program that has been developed.
4. The concepts, (and misconceptions), that the members of faculty have developed in regard to college reading programs in general, and to the local program specifically.

The need for achieving faculty support becomes obvious when one understands the historical development of college reading programs. Let us spend a moment in developing such a historical perspective. Two developments merit attention.

First, we have recently witnessed a rather dramatic explosion of interest in reading improvement programs for adults. This interest, which today is not at all confined to the college campus, undoubtedly started and was nurtured on the college-university campus. Such courses are now maintained by industry, the military, adult education programs in many communities, as well as a number of high schools.

51

The second fact is that after many years of experience on the college campus, reading improvement programs have made small, almost imperceptible progress and negligible impact on the university community. With very few exceptions, each program that still exists is a tiny campus beachhead precariously held by a handful of dedicated people willing to work with inadequate resources. In the past few years the college campus has been characterized by growth, expansion and, to some degree, a reprieve from financial famine. But, amid this growth and partial prosperity, most of the reading programs on the various campuses seem to get little relief in the form of adequate space, materials and staff.

In addition to the lack of adequate financial support and adequate staffing, some college reading programs have not found staunch allies among the faculty. At best, it would be a minority of faculty who have developed the conviction that such a program carries its weight in the intellectual community of higher education. Despite the growth of college programs in the past two decades, recent studies[1] indicate that neither the number of new programs nor the number of college students who participate in existing programs is increasing. Shaw reports that approximately 14% of college respondents reported reading programs at their institutions had been abandoned.[2]

Many college reading programs were started as somewhat of a peripheral operation, perhaps labeled as a "pilot" or "experimental" program. Years later, they still function in much this same atmosphere. Compared with established academic disciplines, college reading programs are relatively new offerings and, as such, encounter misunderstandings, marginal acceptance and outright hostility. Let us look very briefly at some of the problems faced by college reading programs which are roadblocks to interaction and cooperation between reading programs and established curricula at the college level.

The first problem is the lack of understanding on the part of the academic community that learning to read is a complicated developmental process. The developmental nature of reading is the basis for the contention that college students, (as well as the faculty of the various colleges), could with systematic practice, become more effective readers. Individuals responsible for the reading program feel that the rest of the faculty should know that reading skill is developmental and, thus, teaching reading to college students can be justified on the same basis as exists for teaching mathematics and English at this level. We must accept the challenge that it is our responsibility not only to state that learning to read is developmental in nature, but we must never stop reiterating it until our colleagues in the other disciplines understand this fact. We might remember that some of these people have been saying for years that "college students do not read with enough efficiency to meet the demands of college courses."

This brings us to our second problem. Many faculty members in the various academic areas start from the premise that inefficient reading is concrete evidence of lack of intellectual ability. Thus, all attempts at read-

ing improvement are viewed as "remedial" in nature. More specifically, teaching reading at the college level is seen as an attempt to salvage the academically inept. There are always some faculty members who display an emotional reaction against trying to help students who do not measure up on all criteria presently associated with genius. It is difficult, and sometimes impossible, to get such individuals to even see the point that reading ability is developmental in nature.

A third problem is that college reading improvement courses have evidenced a tendency to rely quite heavily on speed reading technique and mechanical devices. It has been noted that college reading programs are quite similar and that one common characteristic is that they have become machine-centered and rate oriented.[3] Paralleling this trend on the campus, there has been a rapid growth in the manufacture and distribution of packaged reading programs and various gadgets for increasing rate of reading. These invariably stressed "speed reading" and flooded the mails with advertisements which made fantastic claims and equated speed reading with the total reading process.[4]

The popular press has published and exploited sensational claims of achievement in rate of reading. Thus, in the minds of some people, all college-adult reading courses are thought of, primarily, as being advocates of speed reading. There has been a reaction against this limited concept of reading improvement and the extravagant claims which have been widely publicized. If a college program does offer a balanced program, every effort should be made to see that faculty and students do not label the program as a "speed reading" course.

We have briefly reviewed three problems—lack of understanding that acquiring reading skill is a developmental process; interpreting college reading programs as being maintained primarily for students with low academic potential; and equating all programs with speed reading. Each of these, and many other issues, can lead to misunderstandings and lack of support for developmental reading programs. We turn now to suggestions as to how closer articulation might be achieved. Since colleges and universities differ markedly from each other, a response which would be successful at one institution may be totally inadequate at another. The following are simply suggestions which may lend themselves to modifications to fit local situations.

Responses Which May Be Useful

1. Continue to explain to colleagues that learning to read is developmental—that critical reading is not learned once and for all, or at a given grade level.
2. If your program is a balanced one, stress this fact to your colleagues. At the same time, cite the very valid justifications for adults developing flexibility in rate and skimming ability.
3. Discuss the college reading program with faculty members and invite them to attend the reading course.
4. As opportunities present themselves, write informational rather than inspirational articles for the alumni magazine, student paper, etc.
5. Explain reading program goals and procedures to groups such as counselors, freshmen advisors, instructors teaching the beginning English course. Invite these individuals to call the reading service to the attention of their students at the beginning of each term. Provide each person who indicates willingness to cooperate with a one or two sentence announcement to read in class and a few one-page brochures to hand out to any interested student.
6. If your program is not primarily remedial, or if it is not designed primarily for the lowest 10% of students, be sure these facts are stressed over the campus.

7. Never offer the program to more students than the staff and facilities warrant. Impress on those turned away that this decision was necessary. Students who want to get into a good reading improvement course are much better assets to the program than large numbers of students who were offered a poor, disorganized, inadequate type of training.
8. As soon as possible, present some data which indicates the values which accrue from student's experience in participating in the reading improvement course. Do not stress gains in comprehension which are, in essence, traceable to an increase in items attempted on the post test. Do not equate post-test gains in rate with permanent habit changes.
9. Be sure your program merits student and faculty support; then ask these groups for support.

In conclusion, try inviting specialists from other fields to conduct a session of the reading improvement course. The English instructor can work with many facets of reading such as choral reading of a poem, paraphrasing a short passage of prose, the psychologist may work with propaganda analysis; the journalist may point up the necessity of background knowledge for understanding a syndicated columnist or editorial, or the varied treatment of the same news event item by different newspapers and magazines. As persons across the campus participate in the program, they will tend to see the program as college or university wide. A college reading program should not become, and must not remain, "an island unto itself" —it must become involved in the total higher educational program.

Footnotes

(1) Causey, Oscar S. "College Reading Programs in The Nation", in Oscar S. Causey (Ed.) **Fifth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities**, Texas Christian University Press, Fort Worth, Texas 1956, PP. 135-37.
(2) Shaw, Phillip B., "Integration of Reading Instruction with 'regular' college offerings", in Emery P. Bliesmer and Albert J. Kingston Jr. (Eds.), **Tenth Yearbook—The National Reading Conference for College and Adults**, Texas Christian University Press, Fort Worth, Texas 1961 PP. 113-23.
(3) Staiger, Ralph C. "Significant Elements In Reading Programs", in Oscar S. Causey (Ed.) **Seventh Yearbook of The National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults** Texas Christian University Press, Fort Worth, Texas 1958 PP. 20-33.
(4) Heilman, Arthur W., "Rapid Reading: Uses and Abuses", **The Nation** Dec. 9, 1961 PP. 467-69.

HOW STRUCTURED PSYCHOTHERAPY CAN ASSIST STUDENTS IN THEIR ACADEMIC AND SOCIAL LIVES

E. Lakin Phillips

George Washington University

Psychotherapy is a technology that stands midway between basic science on the one hand, and the practical, social affairs of daily life on the other hand. In this midway position, psychotherapy can be squeezed from either side—it can be so limited and stringent and austere and pure, that it fails its practical demands; or it can be so subject to fluctuating and ill-considered demands that it loses its scientific moorings and becomes ultimately of no value.

At this time, I am going to suggest some ways in which psychotherapy can be based on a more fundamental set of principles, and illustrate how this effort can lead to fruitful practical results at the clinical level.

Students arrive at the therapist's office in search of help for themselves in relation to two general sets of problems: efficient use of time and energy for their academic requirements; evalation of themselves in relation to other people. Both of these problems may be viewed as discrepancies in the lives of the students. The students present problems; they present **discrepancies.** The discrepancies refer to observed differences between the way they act, feel, think, on the one hand, and the way they predict they should act, feel, think, on the other hand. Here we have a fundamental theoretical concept—discrepancy—and with it an efficient and effective way of entering into the matrix of living represented in the life of the student.

Logically there are only three ways to reduce the distance between two points, the discrepancy between what is observed and what is deemed theoretically desirable. These three ways are: move point 'A' toward point 'B'; move 'B' toward 'A'; or move them both toward a central position between them.

A student reports that he loses his temper with his friends too often and is actually risking alienating them. He observes that they go out for cokes without him, that peers don't drop into his room to "shoot the breeze" with him, that he is spoken to in restrained and guarded terms by others, and so on. What the student is saying is that there is a big difference between the way he observes his relationships going on the one hand, and the way he would like to see them procede on the other hand. This is a discrepant position.

How do we then procede in the therapy? Several things can follow at this point. One, we can ask the student to describe more fully how he actually behaves at the time he feels rejected. We can also ask him to recall how he behaved before he observed the rejections mounting to a discernable level. We can ask him, as a third type of question, what he thinks he might do when he observes he is snubbed by others. In this latter instance he is asked to come up with solutions other than the ones he has been observing in himself.

We imply by these questions, also, that the student can learn to act and feel differently. How can he learn to act differently? Does he have to change his perception of others and of himself first? Some therapists will say he does. Others, including myself, are inclined to ignore perception as a pivotal concept and say that it "comes about" as does the jib sheet on a sail boat, when the direction of movement is altered. The student can react in different ways if he is to change his behavior. Any and all of these ways can be delineated. Some of them will work better than others for him. He may, considering himself as point 'A' and other people as point 'B'—he may move 'A' (himself) toward 'B' (others). He may ask them to go with him; he may drop in on others; and so on. He may, in effect, take a responsibility himself to alter the discrepancies between himself and others.

It is better, if he can take this tack, to make the moves himself, than it is to expect others to come to him. This is one reason that people do not progress better and faster in therapy—they are not taught sufficiently clearly that much, if not most, of the responsibility for change is up to them. If a therapy is passive, exploratory, contemplative, it may not move the patient to action at all, or it may move him to action only by chance or by indirection.

Discrepancies can be overcome by some movement, by some activity, by some responsibility-taking—this is our principle. Once the patient is active, a multitude of possibilities exist for altering behavior. The locus of the problem is put in front of the patient, in terms of his choices and selections; it is not buried in his past. The problem, the discrepancy is here and now, nearer than hands and feet; it is active, alive.

Some principles of action can be delineated at this point. The more principles of action, the more avenues open to us, the better the chances of finding ways and means of solving problems. An exhaustive supply of action-principles is not possible at this juncture; however, some examples are herewith offered for consideration:

1. Take action at point(s) nearest the "problem area" or nearest the discrepancy. For example, if a student waits until the last minute to study, a program of timed intervals of study are needed, not last-minute rushes to retrieve past losses.
2. Survey as many contributing conditions as possible. This often includes setting up an overall plan of action. In regard to studying, this would mean developing an overall plan and a daily schedule.
3. Block off irresponsible behavior, or behavior that is considered "in error" so as to preclude practicing the wrong responses. Have students correct their incorrect work, finish incomplete work, retrace steps, when these steps preclude or replace distracting, error-ridden work.
4. Center attention on variables or conditions that are amenable to control. For example, the amount of time students spend studying is important in their academic work. This is more important than their "personality type", or some other such all-inclusive variable.
5. Select, for study, variables that are functionally related to the condition one wants to control. In the case of personality disorders, it is not retrieving the past history that is important, but setting present conditions so that confidence and self-direction, guide one's behavior.

All of these "techniques" if we may call them that represent ways to interfere with pathological behavior, or ways to overcome erroneous and non-productive behavior.

The person represents a system-in-operation. By definition, wherever there is a problem, the system can be said to operate in terms of some discrepancy between what is theoretically possible on the one hand, and what has actually been observed on the other hand. The therapeutic task is to

define first the area of discrepancy. These discrepancies may be felt and reported on by the student himself; or they may be observed by others; or both may occur. Once there are some definitions and descriptions of discrepancies, then one can enter into the behavioral system of a person with the intent on trying to modify the reported discrepancies.

At this time at George Washington University, we are attempting to enter into the behavioral system of students who come to us—or who are sent to us—because their academic work is below what is anticipated on the basis of their abilities; or because they do not function well in personal or social ways with others.

We are trying several avenues to solving problems via short-term therapy contacts. We are trying highly organized groups; permissive or non-directive groups; work with individuals in individual therapy for brief sessions weekly (15-30 minutes); situations in which students come in and write out in a notebook what their problems are, which are answered before the next appointment time, and the students spend little or no time with a therapist in the usual sense of therapy.

It is too early to tell how these approaches are going to turn out. Several hypotheses suggest themselves, however, and will be examined. One hypothesis is that the more action-centered therapies will produce better results; results in terms of cognitive variables (Q-sorts, e.g.), and in terms of overt behavior (personality tests and grades). This is reasonable if we consider that it is important to specify criteria and ways of moving toward criteria objectives in psychotherapy as much as it is in other interests in behavior science.

We are assuming, too, that short-term efforts are productive and not impossible or meaningless. If short-term efforts are valid, then let us have more of them, and more research on what is effective in terms of given criteria.

We are going to try some other approaches which I can barely mention in passing right now: one is to assemble a group and let them provide their own leadership, perhaps on a rotating basis, provide the group only with a broad structure which says they must come to meetings and must attempt to find answers to the problems presented by each participant. Another approach is to give programmed instruction (in Alegbra, English, History, or any Social Science) where the student is not only in arrears academically but is a troubled person as well. This procedure would operate under the assumption that any salutary efforts would have some worthwhile consequences.

A third proposed short-term procedure is to have students in individual therapy see different therapists in serial order, returning after 3 or 4 visits to the first therapist again. This procedure would rest on the assumption that repeating the problem solutions through discussions with several therapists would have a reinforcing outcome on the problem-solving of the student.

We feel that therapists have been too conventional in their approaches. There are many, many variations on the patient-sees-therapist routine, and some attention should be given the embellishment of this general routine, but with more cogent variations introduced at every turn where there is some prospect that results may be interesting or salutary.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN ADULT READING

Marvin S. Joslow

The Reading Institute Of Boston

Perhaps we should begin by stating unequivocally that there are really no new developments in adult reading. At the same time, let me suggest that there should be! The fact that we, as reading specialists, are becoming more and more aware of the reading needs of the adult community makes it appear that we have begun to tap a major resource for education heretofore generally disregarded. Within the past ten years, we have seen a remarkable resurgence of energy for learning and study by adults in every profession, business, and vocation, motivated largely by economic and social pressures.

We have observed a surge of activity in adult education programs generally, and in adult reading programs specifically. Reading for adults has become standard operating procedure in every major adult education center in the nation. Indeed, literally dozens of schools and clinics have been established to meet the increasing demand for these services—some good and some bad—but all with the purpose of helping adults to master the tools for learning.

A legitimate program in adult reading varies, of course, with the purposes for training. Formal evaluation, therefore, is a main concern, encompassing not only the use of standardized measures of reading achievement, but also a careful examination through direct, face-to-face communication, of the educational goals and objectives of every adult student. The same careful analysis of reading skills that represents effective evaluation of young students in remedial or corrective programs must necessarily apply to adults. We have no right or license to assume, even, that a college graduate, for example, is without a special reading need requiring special attention and programming. To assume that every adult can learn and profit from a course in rapid reading is ludicrous—and far from the truth. Actually, a very small percentage of adults enrolled in rapid reading courses can profit to any significant extent from such a program. But because there are so many intangibles in services of this kind, a "measured" speed in words per minute becomes almost the only means of determining progress and growth. To apply true-false or multiple choice tests as the exclusive evaluation of the level of comprehension achieved is equally

ludicrous for these are, in essence, only a small and minor part of the total comprehension processes derived from any reading effort. To give every student the impression that he has become a superior reader, to build up false hopes, and to suggest that he has achieved the epitome of verbal skill from such programs is both unethical and fraudulent. To suggest that every student has resolved his reading problems after two or three months of training and can go forward with vigor to a lifetime of reading and study is unfair and false. At best, the transfer for most is minimum.

The adult student with reading problems finds himself in the unhappy dilemma of being, first, undersophisticated with regard to basic reading skills, and second, oversophisticated with respect to experience and insight. These students have an extremely low tolerance of frustration; they react more emotionally and articulate their reaction more vocally, not verbally. They tend to reject the standard materials employed in the remedial teaching of children, and cannot handle higher level content despite their insistence that they can. They allow interferences from the home, the job and innumerable outside influences to thwart the continuity of their program. They often prefer certain types of teachers, or certain types of teaching approaches which require inordinate time schedules. They set standards far beyond their range of skill or achievement, project their term of instruction, demand guarantees for improvement, and call in at the last minute to cancel their lesson.

If we are willing to accept these factors as an integral part of our teaching responsibilities to this group, then we can do the job. This is where we really need a new approach in the teaching of reading, and new developments in methods, procedures and techniques. From an educational point of view, the adult reading casualty is an orphan in this society. He is continually rejected or ignored, continually frustrated in his modest efforts toward self-improvement, and eternally limited in his drive for advancement. Surprisingly, he is not exclusively the laborer, the unskilled worker, the high school drop-out or the product of poor public education. He is very often the professional, the white collar worker, the "successful" businessman, the status member of his community. He's often the one who joins Great Decisions, Great Books and Library Associates; the one who attends the Book and Author luncheons. He's often the glib speaker, the aggressive debater, the concert goer and the museum visitor. But he doesn't read, not because he won't, but because he can't. He's the one who compensates for his weaknesses, rationalizes his limitations, and substitutes non-verbal experience as a learning tool. He's that tragic reminder to all of us that we failed to do the job of teaching him how to read at a time when he should have learned how to read, but we haven't really failed if we can still reach him. Yes, we have to wait for him to come to us, but he must have something to come to. We are the ones who are responsible for giving status to adult reading programs—programs that can do the job within our professional limitations. We have been beguiled by the national fad for speed reading—a pastime which we have made synonymous with

adult reading, and have pushed this program to the brink of stupidity. At the same time, we have sacrificed that larger and far more important group of functionally illiterate adults who can sincerely profit from our special services. In the interest of a fair and equitable distribution of our time and talent, and as a vital part of our professional objectives, we are duty bound to consider our responsibility in teaching adults how to read.

Where do we begin? Let's look for a moment at the standardized measures available to us which we might use as a partial evaluation of adult reading difficulties. Reading inventories are exclusively geared to the elementary, secondary or college levels. The content is scholastic rather than empirical, and biased academically to the point of being generally inapplicable for our specific purposes. The norms are similarly inapplicable and largely invalid as a means of determining grade level in that there is no normative sampling beyond the grade limits of the test. How, then, can we adequately measure the reading skills of adults in a standardized test? It is fair to assume that a survey test is inadequate for our purposes. We can largely discount any attempt to adapt higher level content from any variety of adult level resources for nonstandardized testing in that this material is likely to be too difficult. There simply are no valid measures available, a matter which presents a unique challenge to any of us— to construct and formalize an appropriate tool for evaluating adult reading skills at the levels indicated. Our major concern is this: what do we want to measure, and how?

Available materials for our teaching purposes are similarly limited. We who have worked closely with adults in need of remedial help know too well their reaction to materials built for remedial work with children. Their response to this content ranges anywhere from passive resistance to overt hostility. If they are serious in their purposes for learning as we are in our purposes for teaching, they must not be stigmatized in their efforts on their own behalf. Dignity and pride are the keynotes of an effective program with these adults.

Considerable work needs to be done to improve the quality of adult material at the basic reading levels. Whereas the teaching skills and purposes would remain essentially the same as those found in most remedial level materials, content control must be considered in light of these purposes. Subject matter, illustrations, format and visual aids need to be adapted, modified and adjusted; they must be made relevant and appropriate for teaching with this group. Concepts and content must be sophisticated enough to create a challenge and desire for study. There can be no compromise on this point if effective results are to be achieved. Where are these materials?

The term of instruction, of course, will vary with the nature of the difficulty, the learning power of the student, and his continued motivation to receive the help he needs. In this regard, we, as reading teachers, must offer the stimulation and be sensitive to the problems of each student. We must provide the ongoing counseling necessary to effect the student's

growth and adjustment to his new learning experience. We must be willing to listen to his problems, however minor, for these problems are often intimately identified with his personal frustrations and failures. We must be prepared to work with the total person and give him status as an individual. Finally, we must encourage these adults to transfer actively their new skills to their day-to-day activities, both off and on the job. A long-term personal reading program must be estabished, and a means provided for checking the results of this program. There must be follow-through, on their part and ours.

What teaching techniques will we employ with these adults? Shall we work with them in a group or in an individual setting? We can use a combination of both, with the group setting for informal counseling sessions at perodic intervals, to allow each student to express himself concerning his needs, to commit himself to his responsibilities in the learning process, and to share his goals and objectives in his course of instruction. We can apply a supportive setting in a loosely organized therapy situation designed to modify existing fears and anxieties. We can attempt to strengthen security and confidence, and orient toward self-development and self improvement.

Simultaneously, we can initiate an individual learning experience in a reading program specifically planned according to need. This is not going to be rigidly controlled, but rather, flexible and adaptable in both approach and content. It must be pragmatic and realistic—we must not teach reading for the sake of teaching reading. Our total emphasis must be directed toward the development of skill which can be practically utilized and efficiently applied. Our role in either setting is fundamental to the success of the program. We must combine the "tools of our trade" with the understanding of the psychology of learning; the insights and maturity gained from experience with a thorough knowledge of our field of specialization.

As reading levels increase beyond the basic stage, appropriate reading materials must be employed. Such content is available in limited form through adapted classics and skill builders, but a careful scrutiny of these resources will quickly make apparent the fact that we ourselves might often have to create new material either through original effort or through a deliberate modification of so-called adult level content. This becomes a critical step in the total process of helping the student to help himself. He must be encouraged to use the library frequently. It is sometimes possible to arrange with the local librarian a plan to work directly with the student, to suggest materials based on his interest, and guide him intelligently in the selection of appropriate content. As new needs and problems arise, we must be ready to step in to breach the gap upon request. At the same time, we will encourage the student's own independence in resolving his problems. In the fullest sense, we have combined both teaching and counseling in an intensive educational experience. We have responded to and worked closely with a compound reading difficulty. But within this area we have noted the many problems which we face in implementing a sound and professional approach to the need.

We cannot ignore our duties or reject our responsibilities to anyone who legitimately seeks our assistance in reading. Let us not, therefore, reject those adult students, who by reason of lack of training, opportunity, or because of reasonable limitation, have been unable to achieve the reading skills necessary to more effective, intelligent and productive performance at home, on the job, and in the community. It is in this context that new developments in reading must be attempted within the framework of our specialization and in the interest of our obligations.

A SURVEY OF LITERACY EDUCATION COURSES

Richard W. Cortright

Laubach Literacy Fund

The teaching of reading usually denotes (1) elementary school classes, (2) college improvement classes, or (3) speed-up reading classes for adults. To professionals it denotes a continuous or developmental process of learning without segmented time boundaries.

Only recently, since World War II, has there arisen an intensification of interest among professional reading specialists and other educators in the problem of teaching adults to read. Heretofore the impetus to this interest was generated by a random few in those nations which were not yet emerging, but which were still inert. This fact is reflected by a small body of popular articles in national magazines and a rather uneven trickle of academic studies, usually in the related disciplines of sociology or psychology.

The confrontation of professionals and the public to the statistics of adult literacy in America during World War II, the necessary social concern over ethnic minorities, and the recent avowal of concern for the economic stark-poor have placed the "facts of (literacy) life" before the public. Academic foresight has provided educational leadership in a few universities to cope with the problem of adult illiteracy.

According to the United Nations, seventy percent of the people of the world are adult functional illiterates, and according to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare there are some 10,000,000 adult Americans in the same category. Each nation has its own criterion for illiteracy. In the United States illiteracy may be explained by the use of (18 plus, 5 minus) formula: that is, an adult 18 years old or older with a 5th grade education or more is a functional literate. Using this criterion illiteracy rates by percentage per state are as follows:

HOW THE STATES RANK IN LITERACY
ESTIMATED PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS AGED 18 AND OVER IN 1960 WHO COMPLETED LESS THAN 6 YEARS OF SCHOOL—50 STATES AND D. C.

RANK (1)	STATE (2)	PERCENT (3)	RANK (1)	STATE (2)	PERCENT (3)
	50 States and D. C.	10.1%	27	Pennsylvania	8.1
1	Utah	3.3	28	New Jersey	8.2
2	Iowa	3.5	29	Missouri	8.3
3	Idaho	3.9	30	District of Columbia	8.4
4	Oregon	3.9	31	Rhode Island	8.7
5	Washington	4.0	32	Maryland	9.0
6	Nebraska	4.2	33	New York	9.1
7	Wyoming	4.2	34	Alaska	9.6
8	Kansas	4.3	35	Oklahoma	10.1
9	Vermont	4.4	36	Florida	10.8
10	Nevada	4.6	37	Arizona	11.7
11	Minnesota	4.7	38	West Virginia	12.9
12	Montana	4.8	39	New Mexico	14.3
13	South Dakota	4.8	40	Virginia	15.3
14	New Hampshire	5.2	41	Texas	15.7
15	Colorado	5.5	42	Kentucky	16.2
16	Maine	5.5	43	Tennessee	17.3
17	Indiana	5.7	44	Hawaii	17.6
18	Wisconsin	6.2	45	Arkansas	18.0
19	Ohio	6.3	46	Alabama	19.1
20	California	6.7	47	North Carolina	19.3
21	Michigan	6.8	48	Georgia	20.6
22	Massachusetts	7.0	49	Mississippi	22.0
23	North Dakota	7.0	50	South Carolina	23.8
24	Connecticut	7.4	51	Louisiana	24.9
25	Illinois	7.4			
26	Delaware	7.7			

With these statistics in mind a survey was prepared to assess the present academic availability of university courses in literacy education in the United States.

The purpose of this survey was to discover the extent of university courses in literacy education. Replies were received from 55 Deans or officers of the Department of Education in a variety of public and private universities, small and large, geographically nationwide. In general, few offerings in literacy education were reported. The institutions replying were:

Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina
Bob Jones University
Bowling Green University
Baylor University
Central State College
Columbus University
Cornell University
Dartmouth University
Denver University
Eastern Illinois University
Florida State University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
Harvard University
Hillyer College
Howard University
Interamerican University of Puerto Rico
John Carroll University
Long Island University
Los Angeles State College
Marshall College
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Miami University
Missouri South University
Mountain State University
Morgan Park College
Northeastern University
New York University
Ohio State University
Phillips University
St. John's University
Southwestern Louisiana Institute
State College of Washington
Temple University
Texas A. & M. University
Tulane University
United States Military Academy
Utah State University
University of Alabama
University of Arkansas
University of Baltimore
University of California
University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut
University of Georgia
University of Hartford
University of Idaho
University of Louisville
University of Miami
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of North Carolina
University of New Mexico
University of Oklahoma
University of Pittsburgh

Following each quesion is a tabulation of the answers which were received:

1. Does your Department or School of Education offer at least one course in adult literacy education?

Yes—10 No—54

2. Is such a course offered in another department of your institution? Which?

Yes—3 (Psychology, Literacy Department, Community College)
No—37

3. How many courses do you offer in literacy education?

One—3 institutions
Two—1
Four—1

4. Instead of having full courses in literacy education, do you offer information on literacy in other courses, such as reading instruction or adult education?

Yes—9 No—14

5. How much time in these courses is devoted to literacy education?

Very little—3
Considerable—1
Sufficient—2
One tenth—1
Included in Adult Education—1
None—3

6. Do you believe that your department or school is the appropriate place to offer literacy education?

Yes—15
No—10
Probably Not—1
Should be in Psychology—1
Perhaps—3
Probably—3

7. If not, where do you think it should be offered?

Extension Division—3
Public Schools—2
Center for Continuing Education—1
Don't Know—2
County Agents—1
State Department of Education—1
Home Demonstration Workers—1
Community College—1
English or language department—1
Evening College—1

8. Do you believe there is a need or demand for courses in literacy education?

Yes—19
No—9
Doubtful—1
Some—1
If there are funds—1
Probably—2
We have had no requests—5
Do you know—2
Not here—2
There is a great need—1

9. Do you have qualified personnel to teach such courses?

Yes—24
No—10
No one who is not otherwise occupied—1
Do you know—1

10. Would you like the names of qualified personnel to teach such courses?

Yes—8
No—21
Do you know—1

11. What universities do you know which offer courses or parts of courses in literacy education?

None—12
Do you know—10
Baylor University—5
Boston University for Foreign Students—1
Ohio State University—
Columbia—1
City College of New York—1
American University or Catholic University—1

The results of this survey of universities in the United States revealed:

1. There was a variety of understanding or misunderstanding of what was meant by courses in adult literacy education. (Items 3, 4)
2. Most universities in the sample did not offer any kind of course in literacy education and, if another course was offered, little time was given to the subject of literacy education (Items 1, 5)
3. When literacy education courses were offered they tended to be offered in a School or Department of Education. (Items 2, 6, 7)
4. Educators tended to be satisfied with the available courses in literacy education or related disciplines. (Items 8, 9, 10)
5. There seemed to be a relation in the minds of educators between a course in literacy education and a course in adult education or language study (Items 3, 7)
6. There was little knowledge of the availability of courses in literacy education in other universities. (Item 11)

The lack at present of higher education to provide leadership in literacy education has been apparent in the results of the survey. Perhaps professional reading specialists may themselves launch a leadership of remedy by stimulating the development of university literacy education courses: (1) To research and develop ways to better educate literacy specialists and (2) to write books and AV and programmed materials for New Literates. This is a new frontier for reading professionals.

INDIVIDUALIZED READING IN FRESHMAN ENGLISH

Phillip Shaw

Brooklyn College

I do not know when, where, or why I was taught that I should regularly give to all of my students in a particular course the same assignments. For my first fifteen years of teaching English, I faithfully upheld this "same-homework-for-all-students" attitude as an axiom of educational procedure. I sought to be critical of how individual students were learning in my classroom, but as for their learning from my courses outside of the classroom, this aspect of education was as blank to me as the other side of the moon. I assigned the same books, chapters, or pages to all students and gave them all the same time during which to complete the readings. Then one day I was recruited for service in the college reading-improvement program. For their courses outside of the classroom. I saw history majors in required mathematics courses laboring over the identical homework given the mathematics majors in these courses. I saw science majors in required English courses bewildered by books that are a challenge to English majors. I can remember a wave of referrals to the reading-improvement course when one instructor assigned that English major's Mount Everest, **Lord Jim** by Conrad, to an entire section of incoming freshmen. I saw superior students

with an appetite for learning barely subsisting on assignments designed to feed the average students. As absurd as it may seem, some of the very best students of the college were attracted to the reading-improvement course because their regular courses were not extending them.

If a college administrator wanted a good hard look at the other side of the moon—how effectively students are learning from their courses outside of the classroom—a good source of insight would be the teachers in the reading-improvement service. No other teachers are likely to be so aware of the extent to which homework given on a campus is educating the students according to their individual interests and aptitudes. The range of these differences among entering freshmen is especially wide. In a typical Freshman English section, for example, the students' scores on the Verbal part of the Scholastic Aptitude Test are likely to range from below 300 to over 500, and sometimes to above 600. Incoming students also can be expected to display a wide range in reading ability, particularly in mechanical reading habits, vocabulary, and the techniques of attacking the new, more specialized kinds of reading at college than they pursued at high school. Such diversity reflects not only the students' varied aptitudes and achievements in English but also their different attitudes toward literature, which range from a personal craving for reading experiences to such resistance to reading that not the literature itself but **Masterplots**, the **Book Review Digest**, and examination review books comprise certain students' reading backgrounds in English.

My earliest experience with a program of individualized instruction in Freshman English was by the plan known as "ability grouping." Entering students were grouped according to demonstrated ability in English into above-average, average, and below-average sections of Freshman English. Since I was conducting the college reading-improvement service, which was universally misunderstood to be only remedial, irresistible forces pulled me into the below-average and average sections only; so I must limit my comments to these. My experience with ability grouping was not happy. In my below-average sections of Freshman English, undoubtedly the students' elementary needs were met more directly than if these students had been scattered in heterogeneous sections. However, during the course I often felt moments of doubt as to whether students gain or lose in a regular English class when extensive skills instruction displaces lessons on literature. It seemed to me that the sections actually were "bonehead English" that should not have counted toward a college degree.

As for my sections of students in the mean between good and bad, they were as characterless as the so-called "mean" temperature of a particular month. In my "bonehead" sections the students at least displayed emotion: resentment at the beginning, pleasure at evidences of improvement, and ultimate satisfaction in functioning at a higher level of performance. Not so the average students. Content to have escaped the stigma of "below-average" and agreeable to being classified as unlikely English majors, they hibernated in the status quo. Further stultifying the classroom was the

absence of the very students who keep a class and teacher alive: the Einsteins and the Bullwinkles. Students learn from each other, often listen to each other more critically than to the teacher, and stimulate each other by spontaneous expressions of agreements and disagreements. The temperatures of the class discussions of these average students were regularly moderate, lacking the heat of insights by good students and the invigorating chill of half-truths by less perceptive students.

I turn now to an experiment on individualized reading that I conducted last semester at Brooklyn College. Two sections of the first half of Freshman English were established with entering freshmen whose scores on the Verbal section of the Scholastic Apititude Test displayed a wide range. The experimental course was based upon the regular syllabus of Freshman English, and the only differences between my experimental and regular sections were due to the individualized practices.

My first objective was to discover the students for whom additional readings might be desirable because the regularly assigned readings were proving meager. I considered recitations exhibiting good understanding of the readings as disclosing likely candidates. I noted 8 of 25 students in one experimental section, and 6 of 25 in the other as students whose appetites I might not be satisfying by my prescribed catering.

The next step was to interview the twenty selected students about their reading backgrounds and characteristics. (The interviews were held during my regular composition-conferences with the students.) In particular, I asked each about his high-school preferences for literature, his recent recreational reading, his self-appraisal as a fast or slow reader, and his judgment about whether the readings in Freshman English thus far were challenging to him, assessed in terms of an average of 1½ hours of homework per class lesson. As could be anticipated because I had selected the better students for the initial conferences, most of the students declared that the course readings appealed to them but took less time than they had expected at the college level. Of the 20 students, 15 estimated that they usually needed to invest only about an hour in the homework. When asked whether they would accept additional reading afforded only to special students, they expressed willingness to try it. Among the remaining 5 students, 2 claimed a need of 2 hours for an admittedly compulsive mastery of each assignment and preferred not to volunteer for supplementary readings. Finally, 3 students expressed surprise that the teacher had guessed their plight, for they already had read far ahead in the syllabus to keep themselves occupied in Freshman English. Five minutes after they left the conference room, these students were in the college library locating a suitable topic for a long-term supplementary reading program in the course.

Before providing additional readings for the fifteen other students who had volunteered for them, I held individual conferences with all of the remaining students in the two experimental sections, with a continued emphasis on reading characteristics. Decisions about additional reading were discussed in terms of the time the student both needed to and wanted

to invest in his English homework. Of the total of 30 students thus interviewed, 5 volunteered for additional reading.

In sum, by the end of the 4th week of the 15-week course, of a total of 50 students, 3 advanced students who had found the regular readings skimpy already had begun term-long supplementary studies, and 20 good students, who needed only the minimum time for doing English homework and who were willing to invest more time, had volunteered for additional readings in the near future.

As for the term-long supplementary reading programs of the three advanced students, one student analyzed Joyce's **Ulysses**; a second studied autobiography in three of Fitzgerald's novels; the third conducted research on Conrad's **Lord Jim**. To obviate the decline of these studies into private pursuits shared only with the teacher, during the term these students periodically presented informal oral reports to the class. Their classmates listened attentively to these talks because the speakers' lively minds naturally dramatized the problems and discoveries of independent study, and because the talks served as practical instruction on the preparation of a research paper, which the class knew would be a future assignment for them.

Although I had provided supplementary reading projects for the three advanced students, their admission during conference that classwork as well as homework in Freshman English was proving unprofitable to them nagged at me. The extent to which these students' time was being wasted in class was suggested by the disparity between their top scores in English on the college entrance examinations, and the necessarily rudimentary nature of Freshman English. Accordingly, I obtained permission to exempt them from compulsory attendance in my course so that they could devote more time to their supplementary reading programs.[1] To motivate these absentees to complete the regular course readings and to maintain their feeling of belonging to their class, I asked the three students to attend class about once every two weeks, whenever they were especially interested in the reading assigned for that particular lesson. During such voluntary attendances, these students at first were part of class discussions of the regular readings from their usual seats, but by midterm and thereafter, they led such discussions from my desk, while I sat with the class. As deputy teachers, the advanced students were motivated to keep up with the regular readings. Their leadership, furthermore, seemed to spark a greater interest in the course among us all, including the teacher.

For the other twenty students who had volunteered for additional homework, procedures were as follows. During a sequence of eight class meetings, for every other meeting two short stories were assigned, one as regular homework and the other as supplementary reading. Since each student had his own copy of an anthology that contained all of the stories,[2] I was able to conduct classroom activities based on the text of both regular and supplementary short stories.

The first extra short story was Faulkner's **Turnabout**, an ingeniously contrived war yarn that, except for an unexpected ending, seems to be glorifying the courage of men in uniform. The story closes with a sudden anti-war preachment that jolts the reader into a drastic reinterpretation of the mood and purpose of the story. Students often overlook the bitter tone of the ending. I launched the lesson on **Turnabout** by asking all of the students, both those who had read the story and those who had not, to examine the ending to locate clues to the author's mood. Then I requested the readers of the story to permit the other students to be the first to discuss the clues and mood—out of context, of course. Shortly, all of the students were participating. Gradually the readers of the story took over the discussion to point out specific narrative details that flipped in a "turnabout" from glory to inglory as a result of the anti-war ending. Since the curiosity of the non-readers of the story had been awakened by their study of its ending, these students listened attentively to the ensuing discussion.

The final two supplementary reading assignments were, respectively, the former and latter half of the novelette, **Heart of Darkness** by Conrad. For the lesson on the first half, students reading it selected at home a paragraph that they found to be especially vivid, and then when they entered the classroom they indicated their choice anonymously on the board. The class analyzed each indicated paragraph out of context to surmise which evocative details had prompted the selecting student to choose it. Then the selector responded. The ensuing cross-currents of personal reactions induced students who had not read the story to participate actively, and seemed to sharpen the reading perception of the students generally. For the second lesson on the **Heart of Darkness** each reader again anonymously designated a paragraph on the board, this time one that was significant in his interpretation of the story. Students who had not read the story thereupon read the two or three paragraphs most frequently cited and discussed their meaning out of context. Then the readers of the story wove these comments and their own reactions into an organic literary commentary on the entire novelette. By this procedure the non-readers of the story were afforded exercises in comprehending significant literary passages and to some extent they shared the fuller reading experience of the other students.

Thus far in the course, only 23 students in the 2 experimental sections had volunteered to leap over the limits of the regular homework into supplementary readings, and 27 had tasted the freedom of this choice only on an audience-participation basis. For the final readings, therefore, the freedom of choice was extended to the regular homework, in which all of the students would engage. At the same time, students wishing to volunteer for additional reading continued to be provided for.

The final readings of the course were either two or three novels on the Freshman English list. The first novel was chosen for the students as common reading. For the second novel, each student made his selection from the six remaining titles on the list. The reading of a third novel on the list was voluntary.[3] So that the students' choices would be prompted

at least by curiosity, if not by an anticipation of a literary experience, I took a copy of the novels to class and read briefly from each, with informal comments.

Implementations of the individualized reading of novels did not enjoy the safeguard against failure possessed by the lessons on the short stories, which were firmly based on selected passages read in class by all of the students. I could not reasonably require every student to bring to class copies of all six novels I decided to develop for each novel read a classroom panel discussion in which only those students who had selected a particular novel would participate. This was somewhat risky—when students do not know what is going on in class, they quickly succumb to the enchanting world seen through the window. But I relied upon two other characteristics of students: students like to listen to each other talk when they are well informed and forthright, and they relish disagreement, especially when students joust in verbal combat. Accordingly, prior to participation on their panels, students were required to submit to me written literary critiques on their chosen novels. Having thus shaped their reactions to the novel into critical viewpoints and resources for supporting them, the students came to the panel well prepared to talk about the novel. And since they felt a certain commitment to the views in the paper that they knew I had read, they were ready to let their verbal fists fly at any hint of a view contrary to theirs. The resulting panel discussions were usually lively and significant. Occasionally I had to catalyze a panel or interrupt a protracted debate—one panel with a dense population of nine students needed some management—but in general I sensed that the class accepted my abdication from the royal front seat as genuine.

As for the group of students reading the optional third novel, I tried to draft all students of above-average achievement in the course to join. All did enlist except two students who pleaded exemption because they were slow readers. Three students not of above-average achievement also volunteered for the supplementary book. Of a total of 50 students, 17 chose to read the supplementary novel. Panels again were the means of implementing the individualized reading. The resulting discussions, however, enjoyed two points of novelty. Because some members of the audience had read each chosen work for the previous assignment, this time the discussions tended to hop back and forth over the fence between the panel and the audience. Secondly, almost all of the students on the panels were the better students of the sections, with the result that the periods when the teacher remained silent were happily longer than ever before in the course.

In one of the experimental sections I encountered a problem that an attempted solution aggravated rather than reduced. Of the students who volunteered to do the extra reading, two of them selected novels not chosen by anyone else. I twice made the mistake of assuming that I could be a substitute for a student. I joined each of the "solo" students in a separate panel. Both were lifeless. I should have requested that at least two students select a particular book.

The teacher who adopts an individualized reading program, thereby becomes heir to what can be either problems or challenges not encountered from "same-homework-for-all-students" instruction. Plans for individualized reading also have built-in limitations. Classroom progress reports and discussions of reading undertaken only by some of the students, and panel discussions of books not read by all are effective as a change of pace from the usual, more formal classroom procedures. Used too frequently, however, individualized practices can lead to disorder. In the above experiment, term-long programs were limited to 3 advanced students out of 50, double assignments required only 4 special lessons out of the total course of 42 meetings, and "self-selection" of reading was adopted for every student well after mid-term and, for the majority of the class, applied to only one book. Individualized practices are like dialect in speech: a few particular evidences here and there have the force of an organic special character. And it is a significantly special character that a limited program of individualized reading in Freshman English can give this course in the eyes of the students: an environment in which the teacher is less paternalistic and the students more self-directed than at high school. Who knows, perhaps at the end of Freshman English that has afforded individualized reading, the students will not sell their course books!

Footnotes

1. Exemption from class attendance is, of course, desirable only for advanced and mature students. Such exemption is not an inherent part of a supplementary reading program. Brooklyn College officially recognizes supplementary independent study by superior students, as one aspect of its "Honors Program."
2. The anthology was **Great Modern Short Stories**, ed Bennet A. Cerf, The Modern Library, 1942.
3. The common novel was **Sons and Lovers**. The titles from which students selected additional reading were: **Look Homeward, Angel, The Great Gatesby, A Farewell to Arms, A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man, Passage to India, Lord Jim.**

LINGUISTICS AND READING: AFTER BLOOMFIELD WHAT?

Stewart H. Benedict

Jersey City State College

The widespread and careful attention focused on Leonard Bloomfield's provocative approach to basic word attack has had at least one very salutary side-effect. It has made those students and teachers of reading not formerly aware of the contributions that linguistics can make to the solution of reading problems acutely conscious of those contributions. But Bloomfield's method is, after all, a practical application of linguistic principles to only one area of a comprehensive field. Can concepts drawn from the science of language be applied elsewhere in reading, and if so how and where?

If we all accept the definition of linguistics as that science which deals with objective and measurable phenomena in language, then we can all agree that everybody is to some degree a linguist, although probably an untrained one. To illustrate: the average listener to Vaughan Meader's **The First Family** would presumably recoil in horror if he were asked to furnish an example of the Greater Boston isogloss in which a post-vocalic liquid in final position is dropped or slurred, but he chuckles appreciatively when he hears that we must approach each new problem "with vigah." Similarly, an erstwhile landlady of mine would, I am sure, be at a loss to discuss levels of usage, but this did not prevent her from announcing herself at my door by saying, "It's me!" and then, remembering that she was speaking to an English teacher, adding hastily, "I mean, it is I!" But, to desert the realm of the anecdotal for that of the factual, people are interested in words, the special province of the linguist. Students at almost any level are intrigued by the fact that a man who treats an acquaintance in a **cavalier** fashion is said not to be **chivalrous,** although he ought to be; that an **idiot** is so called because he speaks in a private and personal **idiom;** or that we should for consistency's sake be talking about the longer, lower 1963 **ipsemobiles.** And, supporters of larger meaning-unit methods in reading to the contrary, it is still the word or the word-group which is the basic repository of meaning. Therefore, since students use language and, like all other human beings, are interested in phenomena related to themselves, by capitalizing on the appeal of such linguistic features as unusual and entertaining etymologies, we can lure them into a greater interest in and a greater consciousness of language, one step along the path toward turning them into better readers.

Apart from this admittedly general and unfocused value that linguistic study may have in connection with reading, there are several more specific purposes which it can serve. One of these is to foster an increased awareness of various structural features of the English language, what C. C. Fries has termed the "major grammatical devices," devices such as word order, inflectional variations, and function words.

Until the increased emphasis on structural grammar in the past thirty years, the importance of word order was certainly not sufficiently appreciated among either teachers or students of English. Yet, as comparative linguistics shows, in those languages whose inflectional variations have disappeared for the most part, word order assumes a primary role as a determinant of meaning. The study of word order finds its chief application in sentence patterns, surely a matter of great concern to the reading specialist. A sophisticated reader knows "intuitively" that in a sentence which begins "Slowly the old woman . . . ." he can usually predict with about ninety percent accuracy how the remainder of the sentence will run; given an opening like "Slowly the old woman rose . . . ." the odds for a correct prognosis should be even higher. With his subconscious anticipatory realization of how the parts of the sentence are to be assembled, then, he is freed from a concern about mechanical details and is able to focus his attention exclusively on the content.

Acquaintance with the apparently minor but irksome problem of inflection should lead to the same sort of sophistication in reading. To cite some simple instances: encountering a noun in the genitive singular, we should be prepared for another noun (or, as an outside possibility, a gerund) following; again, coming across the verb-form does at the start of a sentence, we expect the subject succeeded by another verb-form, since we have to do with a question involving the present emphatic tense.

Of function words all that can be said is that a reader ought to know as many of them as he can. The sole implication here for teachers of reading would seem to be that still another compelling reason exists for forcing premature retirement on Dick and Jane.

Returning to the subject of word-history, while unusual and entertaining etymologies may be used as previously suggested, that is, as a means of heightening linguistic interest, this branch of language study has several more down-to-earth applications. Here is the place, I suppose, to lament the decline in the study of foreign language and especially of the classical tongues; this decline is a special source of unhappiness to those who teach English because it adds one more item to the list that they ought to cover, namely a study of the principal Greek and Latin roots and the major affixes combined with those roots. The absence of serious attention to etymology by our students is probably one of the chief causes of the growing inprecision in the use of words in English, which in turn is one of the principal obstacles to the development of critical reading abilities. Now, it hardly needs saying that language changes, that word meanings change, and so on; the linguist, who attempts always to be descriptive and never to be prescriptive, stands in the forefront of those who insist on acknowledgment of that fact. Yet, reactionary as it may sound, one cannot be enthusiastic about change when it almost invariably tends to make meanings less precise, and that is what has been taking place in American English in our century. This is not to make foolish and carping objection to such expressions as "rather unique," since obviously the word "unique" is coming to be synonymous with "unusual," like it or not. It is, however, to raise a protest against the flood of jargon-words, many of them political or sociological or (alas!), educational, which are making English a muddy language. When, for example, William Jenner, Robert Taft, Margaret Chase Smith, Harry Byrd, Adlai Stevenson and Hubert Humphrey all claim to be "liberal," obviously the word has no meaning whatsoever. Or when a sociologist cited by Henry L. Mencken urges that we call prostitutes "behavior problems," we may chuckle at this ludicrous attempt at euphemism, but it is our native tongue which actually suffers. Training in etymology, however, tends to make students more careful: the person who knows the function of the so-called alpha-privative prefix in Greek will not commit the error of characterizing an amoral act as "immoral" or, even worse, "unmoral." With a more accurate knowledge of what words mean, one is a great deal more likely to be conscious of errors in diction and, hopefully, to read more accurately and more critically.

All of us with an interest in reading would agree, I am sure, that the primary function of most printed matter is the communication of ideas. We would be equally in accord with the notion that anything which causes a division of reader attention between the ideas and the language interferes with the communication process. It must therefore seem paradoxical at first glance for anyone to maintain that linguistic training will be an aid to reading. Yet, however inconsistent it may appear, such is the thesis of this report. If, by the scientific study of some of the phenomena of the English language, its vocabulary and its structure, we are able to make language consciousness so much a part of the student that it becomes language subconsciousness, the result cannot help but be an improvement in reading habits.

Time, too, is working on the side of the reading specialist. Certainly not within one generation, but perhaps within ten, his life will be simpler because English will be simpler. On the basis of historical linguistics it can be stated that what the future holds for English is orthographic reform and the elimination of such irregularities as Germanic and Latin plurals and the principal parts of "strong" verbs.

Already those who object to the retention of archaic spellings in English are sounding the cry for reform. Such novelties as the new Shaw-subsidized alphabet, misguided and naive as it is, are significant because they are symptomatic of a more general discontent than just that of a linguistic dabbler. Our generation is seeing the widespread acceptance of **thru** and it is logical to expect that those who follow will see **tho**, **nock**, and so on.

Change will come in almost all of our minority inflectional variations as well, in the noun sooner, in the verb later. At the present time Latin plurals like **hippopotami** and **cacti** are disappearing; next to go will be **fish** and **sheep** and then **feet** and **children**. Finally, our descendants will someday be saying that "they **goed** downtown and **buyed** some candy." These conjectural forms may appall or horrify the layman, but for the reading specialist, they must be good tidings of great joy, for they are a virtual guarantee that tomorrow will be better.

READING PATTERNS AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Iver L. Moe

State University of Cortland, N. Y.

An instrument designed to provide systematic observations of reading patterns of college students was devised in 1959 at the State University College, Cortland, New York. Three hundred-sixty observations have been made of college students during the past three and one-half years; however, this paper includes only 162 observations. These data include observations made on either of two equivalent forms of a test hereinafter referred to as the Flexibility Profile. One form of the test was given previous to and one subsequent to work in the reading laboratory.

Flexibility Profile

The data-gathering instrument, the Flexibility Profile, was devised by using a series of graded selections from the Science Research Associates Reading Laboratory by Don H. Parker and collaborators.

This writer decided upon the observations to be made and constructed a profile sheet for the entry of such observations. The profile sheet provided spaces for the answers to the multiple-choice questions, a "t" column where reading time in seconds was placed, a "c" column where per cent of comprehension was recorded, and a column "w.p.m." where words-per-minute were tabulated after the student read each of the several selections. Spaces were also provided for **High Oral, Low Oral, Flexibility Index, High Differential** and **Low Differential.**

Administration of the Flexibility Profile

Each student was given a series of articles to read silently. The selections ranged from third-grade level to twelfth-grade level. The reading time in seconds for each selection was recorded, comprehension noted, and words-per-minute calculated in the appropriate spaces on the form. After selections from Orange through Purple were read silently, the student was asked to read orally in third-grade materials. His oral speed was recorded in the space titled Low Oral and oral speed in twelfth-grade material was recorded in the space titled High Oral.

After silent and oral reading was completed the Flexibility Index, High Differential and Low Differential were computed. The Flexibility Index is the difference between reading rate in third-grade material as compared with rate in twelfth-grade materials, hereinafter referred to as college-type materials. Therefore, if a student read third-grade material at 350 w.p.m. and college-type material at 250 w.p.m., his Flexibility Index would be 100 w.p.m. The High Differential was found by comparing the silent and oral speeds in college-type material. If silent reading rate was found to be 200 w.p.m. and oral speed at 170 w.p.m., the High Differential of 30 w.p.m. would be recorded. The Low Differential is the difference between silent and oral speeds in simple materials and it was recorded in terms of words-per-minute.

Description of Cases

All the cases in this report were college students. About 75 per cent were freshmen and the remainder were sophomores, juniors, and seniors. Over 95 per cent either referred themselves or received permissive suggestions from student-personnel advisors.

Presentation of Data

Flexibility Index. The Flexibility Index is the difference between silent reading speed in simple materials as compared to college-type materials. The range was wide. The majority of the cases fell within the two central intervals. The Estimated Mean was 104. Inspection of the data revealed that the majority of cases read third-grade materials from 60 to 119 w.p.m. faster than college-type materials.

High Differential. The data resulting from the observation of the High Differential (the difference between silent and oral rate in college-type material) were studied. Close relationship between silent and oral speeds can be noted. The Estimated Mean of 34 w.p.m. is a reflection of that close relationship.

Low Differential. It can be observed that the Low Differential is another measure of the degree of inflexibility previously observed.

The Estimated Mean was established at 94 words per minute which represents the difference between silent and oral speeds in third-grade materials. The shape of the distributions shows a high frequency of cases around the Estimated Mean.

High Speed. Rates of reading observed in college-type materials were studied. A high frequency was observed in the central interval. The Estimated Mean was 174 w.p.m. It is interesting to note that one hundred-five cases read at a rate of 199 words per minute or less. Only five cases read at 300 w.p.m. or more.

Low Speed. Observations of rates observed during the silent reading of third-grade materials were studied. The shape of the distribution is similar to previous observations. The Estimated Mean of 274 w.p.m. was observed.

Comprehension. The Comprehension scores were made after one reading of the materials used in the Flexibility Profile. Students were not permitted to refer to the material while answering the questions. Questions asked were, in general quite detailed and all were multiple-choice. The distribution of the comprehension scores demonstrated wider variability. The data approached a multi-modal distribution. The Estimated Mean was an unimpressive 67 per cent.

Description of Laboratory Procedures

After students received their pre-tests they were enrolled for work in the reading laboratory. The entire training cycle rarely exceeded fifteen hours.

After examining the reading performance, as measured by the Flexibility Profile, the director made an estimate with regard to the starting

point for each student. The Shadowscope was used as the reading pacer. Most students began training at a point estimated to be approximately 100 words-per-minute greater than performance observed on the pretest. All students began training in third-grade materials.

All students were encouraged to experiment at each session in an effort to arrive at their greatest capability. Students often attempted two rapid readings of material and compared comprehension with one deliberate reading. They were encouraged early in their training to practice between laboratory sessions while engaged in regular reading assignments. As soon as possible, students were encouraged to become autonomous. They initiated their own experiments, timed themselves, recorded results, and often conferred with one another.

As the students approached materials of about mid-difficulty, they were instructed to read about half the time without the pacer. When the student was near the end of his training, the machine was infrequently used. Moreover, at this stage, students were encouraged to bring college textbooks to replace or augment Science Research Associates materials.

Comparison of Pre- and Post Tests

Pre-Test	E.M.	Post-Test	E.M.
Flexibility Index No. 1	104	Flexibility Index No. 2	134
High Differential No. 1	34	High Differential No. 2	274
Low Differential No. 1	94	Low Differential No. 2	344
High Speed No. 1	174	High Speed No. 2	424
Low Speed No. 1	274	Low Speed No. 2	524
Comprehension No. 1	67%	Comprehension No. 2	77%

Summary of Observations

1. The Flexibility Profile is a useful instrument for detecting rigidity of reading patterns.

2. College students tend to read at approximately the same rate whether they are reading third-grade material or college-type material.

3. After training their flexibility increased only slightly, from a Flexibility Index of 104 w.p.m. in the pre-test to 134 w.p.m. in the post-test. On the average students remained inflexible but at higher rate.

4. The High Differential increased from an Estimated Mean of 34 w.p.m. to 274 w.p.m. Since the High Differential is a measure of the difference between silent and oral rates in college-type materials, the findings of this study indicate evidence of significant improvement, at least under laboratory conditions.

5. An increase in Low Differential from 94 w.p.m. to 344 w.p.m. is but another reflection of encouraging results.

6. It can be noted above that High Speed increased from an Estimated Mean of 174 to 424 w.p.m. with a corresponding increase in Low Speed from 274 to 524 w.p.m.

7. An Estimated Mean of 67 per cent comprehension in the pre-test indicates that slow reading rate is no guarantee of excellent comprehension. An average increase to 77 per cent accompanied by convincing rate increase indicate that, within limits, a positive correlation exists between rate and comprehension.

8. While the sample is creditably large, it represents only a small fraction of the total student body at this college. If the sample is a good one and the Flexibility Profile is a valid measure, colleges are graduating a great number of slow, inflexible readers. More studies are urgently needed to determine the exact influence of college reading laboratories upon academic success of college students.

THE IMPACT OF PAPERBACK BOOKS ON READING

Vincent A. Giacco

Popular Library Inc.

I was both pleased and flattered to be invited to speak to this very distinguished group of ladies and gentlemen—and educators. I spent some time with a number of you this morning and I like you. I only hope, that following my talk today, there will be a number of you left who still like me. You see, I did not come to praise you.

I am here to commit a murder and at some time before I leave this rostrum, I hope every one of you will rise and declare me guilty as charged. I came here to destroy apathy—and if anything I say here today goes no further, then there will have been little reason for us to meet. But if we can put these words into action, I feel certain that what I am going to ask you to do just might start something nobody can stop.

Have you ever really thought of yourselves as fighters engaged in a real shooting war? I don't mean the minor skirmishes with school boards, parents or "the" establishment, (although there have been fatalities in those battles). The battle of which I am speaking is the one in which you, as teachers, have enlisted. You selected this profession—and you have indicated the desire and intention to dedicate yourself to the opening of closed minds, to introducing young people to the magic of the printed word and to prodding, stimulating, even forcing them to find out for themselves what the world has to offer them in books.

This is no small war in which you are engaged—and it is neither far-fetched nor over-dramatic to put it in these terms. It's the age-old battle between the forces of reason and enlightenment against fear and ignorance—and each of you represents a very active center of a very large group of adults who have dedicated themselves to enticing young people to read, to enjoy reading and to want to read more. Now let's be practical. Your ammunition in this battle is books.

It may be unfortunate that so many incredible and revolutionary changes have taken place in our lives in recent years that it is sometimes difficult not to be blase when still another phenomenon comes along. And believe me, the paperback book is a phenomenon. This wonderful thing which has happened to the publishing industry in the past 20 years has developed into a new and exciting weapon and its rise has been almost as spectacular as any of the scientific achievements in outer space.

Each of you has heard of the "lost" generation—the "silent" generation —and others. If you don't already know it, your students are called "the paperback generation." (There is some dispute as to whether this refers to their spines, their characters or their reading habits). But they have taken for granted this phenomenon which many adults have yet to discover for themselves. They have learned and accepted the fact that paperbacks are pleasurable, inexpensive, attractive, light-weight and compact, but most important of all, that their choice is virtually unlimited. It is as acceptable to them as the "coke" and Elvis Presley records, and that on their allowances they can own copies of the works of famous scientists, mathematicians, scholars and poets, hitherto available to a select few.

The success of the paperback revolution has been due to some of the points I mentioned a moment ago, but probably the most important of all is that they have been made available. I repeat, available in almost every conceivable type of retail outlet which any of us might enter. Exposure is the word. We have exposed them to the paperback—and as intelligent individuals, I am sure you will agree that no matter how good the product, how good the service, or how good the intention, without exposure you cannot anticipate success! And we have been successful!

This can be evidenced by the fact that in almost any local drug store, any kid waiting for a friend can browse through Euripides, Toynbee, Shakespeare, J. F. Kennedy and Thomas Aquinas. There is almost no limit. And it is not at all unusual to find a cab driver or elevator operator with a paperback copy of "**The History of Western Civilization**" lying beside him for the moment when he is not busy with his work. This cab driver and elevator operator are parents of the students in schools today. It's helpful to know that they, too, accept the paperback book.

But has this paperback revolution really been successful?

It has been reported countless numbers of times by book retailers that they displayed a hard cover edition of a very popular fiction or non-fiction title alongside the new paperback edition and have observed customers actually selecting the paperback, despite the fact that its retail price was even slightly higher.

There are many ways in which psychologists might attempt to explain this—but you must admit that this still amounts to a phenomenon and a new revolution in reading habits. Much has been said, and even more written, about this paperback phenomenon by psychologists, publishers, educators, retailers, librarians and by students, themselves.

Surveys, questionnaires, sales figures and reports directed at the gen-

eral public prove that paperbacks are here to stay and that more people are buying and reading books because of them. A recent study by the National Council of Teachers of English on the advisability of utilizing paperbacks in classrooms brought out nine very important and interesting reasons as to why they should be used. The last of these was, "students like them." That's right, "students like them." That, more than anything else was the most important discovery revealed by this survey.

Half the battle is won with any student if what he is assigned is something he "likes to do." And in your particular field, paperbacks represent the starting point in any accelerated program you may wish to undertake.

The first step is obvious. That is to make as much reading material as possible available to them. This is the publishers' job—with important help from teachers. Once the books are available, the next step is proper guidance and stimulation for the students to discover what truly interests them and to make these books available to them at the one place each day in which they congregate in the greatest numbers—the school. This is your job, with important help from the publisher.

Are publishers doing their part? Well there is no doubt that publishers are increasingly expanding their titles and searching every avenue through which their books can be made more readily available to teachers and students alike.

We can start something, you and I, right here and now, and watch the results spread throughout the country in a very short time. Now is the time that I plan to push that button that will start a chain reaction the likes of which have not been seen in the past decade.

Books are, after all, words. Speeches are words. And speeches about books are words about words. I have seen far too many similar conferences end in mere words. But this one can and should be different. This one can end in action!

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF COLLEGE READING DIRECTORS BEYOND THE CLINIC DOORS

Frank L. Christ

St. Vincent College

You may wonder at the audacity of my title "The Responsibility of College Reading Directors Beyond the Clinic Doors" when you reflect that recent research on college reading indicates an ever increasing need for more reading instruction and remediation within the clinic walls. Carter, writing in the **Eighth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults,** concludes that of 1,029 students completing freshman

year "68 per cent reported that they had never been taught how to read a chapter effectively, 70 per cent indicated that they had not been taught to concentrate upon a reading activity, 64 per cent had not been taught how to critically evaluate a writer's bias and use of preconceived ideas."[1] Results of other studies by Halfter and Douglas[2] and by Hadley[3] suggest a similar conclusion.

You may further question the prudence of my topic when you reflect that of the total number of college students who need help in reading and study skills, not enough of them are within the clinic walls to receive this help. Time, trained personnel, space, and the budget seem ever disproportionate to the realities of need and demand. Yet perhaps one way to aid the student outside the clinic as well as others who may not find room in the clinic is to accept the challenges that exist beyond the clinic doors.

Let us look first at seven of the challenges just outside the clinic doors yet within the college community.

1. Early identification of student reading and study skills problems. A testing program for all freshmen, administered either at registration or during orientation, would uncover potential academic deficiencies. A minimal program should include a reading test as well as a study habits and attitudes inventory. Test results would be made available to freshman advisors.

2. Reading and study skills orientation program. During the first month of class and after the mass orientation program, a series of seminars in basic reading-study skills would help students to bridge the gap between high school habits and college responsibilities and assignments. A study skills manual would be a required purchase for all freshmen.

3. In-service program for freshman faculty. The responsibility for freshman failures does not always lie with the students. Faculty indifference to and ignorance of students' reading-study problems might be corrected by a seminar centered around Philip Shaw's persuasive article "First Cousins: College Reading Specialists and Freshman Teachers."[4] An annual review of the psychology of learning might be profitable for all faculty members.

4. A self-help program for interested students. For upperclassmen and freshmen not serviced by the clinic, a self-help program might be provided. Perhaps a modification of the Auburn Reading Laboratory Plan, reported in the Tenth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference,[5] can extend reading-study techniques to mature students able to work under minimal supervision.

5. An exhibit of special learning materials. It is not unusual to discover that students are ignorant of special learning materials that offer models for imitation and short cuts to proficiency. Such materials as Barzun and Graef's **The Modern Researcher**, Saunder's **An Introduction to Research in English Literary History**, Wilkening's **A Student's Psychology Handbook**, Murphey's **How and Where To Look It Up**, and many other summaries, special dictionaries and handbooks, data guides and vocabulary

cards, can be brought to the attention of the student through a library or bookstore exhibit.

6. An upgrading of student reading taste. A survey of many collegiate bookstores might result in recommendations to the bookstore manager that he make available paperbacks such as Stefferud's **The Wonderful World of Books**, Adler's **How To Read a Book**, Weber's **Good Reading**, Lueders' **College and Adult Reading List**, Fadiman's **Lifetime Reading Plan**, Bennett's **Much Loved Books**, Sertillanges' **The Intellectual Life**, as well as titles in vocabulary building, spelling, and study techniques.

7. Opportunities for guest lecturing. In some courses, such as English, Psychology, and Education, professors would be willing to relinquish the podium to the Reading Director were he to volunteer his services.

All these activities and many more are the concern of many college reading directors who extend their influence to the college community that is just beyond their clinic doors.

But beyond this challenge lies another and even greater challenge for college reading directors. At the farthest point are the community and its families; at the nearest, the public, private, and parochial schools with their teachers and students.

The barriers, real and imagined, that exist between "town and gown" must be removed. The college must take the initiative to develop and sustain efficient reading instruction. To wait for a mandate from the people, or an engraved invitation from the school board, or a pleading phone call from the principal to raise the level of reading instruction in the lower school is unrealistic and unwise.

In the recent publication of the Harvard-Carnegie Reading Study, **The Torch Lighters**, co-operating colleges reported five main types of programs for upgrading reading instruction in local schools: (1) consultant services; (2) college sponsored reading clinics; (3) in-service training programs; (4) projects such as surveys, classes for gifted children, instructional "crash" programs; and (5) reading conferences.[6]

Since most colleges reported that their programs were consultative and informal and only a few institutions reported activity in the other four areas, a major responsibility of the college reading director can be inferred from a sympathetic reading of Recommendation 16 of the Harvard-Carnegie Reading Study: ". . . it is recommended that colleges appoint a liaison person to work directly with the local school system to achieve closer cooperation between the schools and the college and to assist the public schools in up-grading reading and other academic instruction."[7]

This appointment should be publicized locally, listed officially in the college catalogue, and brought periodically to the attention of elementary and secondary school officials. Unlike the wording in Recommendation 16, however, I would urge you to consider working with all local schools, public, private, and parochial, since each of the three has similar pupil and faculty needs in reading and study skills and from each of the three your college will enroll its students.

If the college reading director be appointed liaison between the lower schools and the college, the lag between research data and current practices (a lag estimated at twenty to fifty years) can be reduced considerably. Certainly the first task of the new liaison officer would be to bring the twenty-two recommendations of the Harvard-Carnegie Reading Study to the attention of the education department at teacher training institutions.

Next, if no local IRA Council exists, the college reading director should organize one. Through its local meetings, national conferences and publications, local reading teachers would be stimulated professionally. Through a local council newsletter, distributed to both member and non-member reading teachers and administrators, information of latest trends in reading instruction, reports of successful reading practices, summaries of relevant research and announcements of conferences, institutes, courses, and seminars, could revitalize reading instruction at all levels within the local college area.

Finally, far beyond the college reading director's clinic door, but still within the scope of his responsibility, lies the community with its industries, its civic clubs, its people. There are reading programs for business executives to be organized. There are civic clubs members to be informed about reading problems. There are PTA mothers and fathers to be motivated to provide reading experiences and materials in the home.

Behind the clinic doors, the college reading director must devote his time, imagination, intelligence, and effort towards correcting, developing and stimulating each and every student who crosses the clinic threshold.

Beyond the Clinic doors, the college reading director must make himself and his remarkable knowledge and talent accessible to all: the non-clinic collegian, colleagues on the faculty, administrators and teachers of public, private, and parochial schools, business and industrial groups, civic clubs and PTA's. Only by meeting these responsibilities can college reading directors fulfill their educational roles so imaginatively described by the title of the Harvard-Carnegie Reading Study—the roles of **"The Torch Lighters"** without whom the torches of learning are useless.

Footnotes

1. Homer Carter, "Effective Use of Textbooks in the Reading Program," in **Eighth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference for Colleges and Adults** (Fort Worth, 1959), p. 156.
2. Irma T. Halfter and Frances M. Douglass, "'Inadequate' College Readers," in **Journal of Developmental Reading**, I (Summer, 1958) pp. 42-53.
3. L. S. Hadley, "New College Students Lack Study Techniques," in **School and Society**, LXXXV (November 9, 1957), p. 353.
4. Philip Shaw, "First Cousins: College Reading Specialists and Freshman Teachers," in **Journal of Developmental Reading**, III (Spring, 1960) pp. 149-157.
5. Barbara F. Edwards, "In the Dawning of Our Knowledge," in **Tenth Yearbook of the National Reading Conference** (Fort Worth, 1961) pp. 9-16.
6. Mary C. Austin and others, **The Torch Lighters** (Cambridge, Mass., 1961), p. 61.
7. **Ibid**, p. 153.

CURRENT STATUS OF READING PROGRAMS IN GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

George L. Stevens

Reading Technics

The objective of this paper is to discuss the current status of reading programs in government. Under this general heading three main topics will be considered. First, the nature of the reading problem in government. Second, the history of efforts that have been made to deal with the problem. Third, the problems that arise in the administration of a reading improvement program in government.

Perhaps the chief reading problem of the government administrator centers around the volume of reading he must do. Surveys have indicated that top level administrators may spend as much as four hours a day just reading. Moreover, despite the length of time spent reading, many of these administrators are concerned about their reading and state that they are not reading everything they should. Many are barely able to keep up with their professional reading and have no time for reading of a more general nature.

There are several reasons for this, but the most obvious is size. Within the past thirty years our federal government has steadily expanded in size and complexity. The United States Government is larger than any single institution, enterprise or corporation in our country.

However, the communication system between and within agencies of the government has not kept pace with this rate of growth and increasing complexity; and today top executives must read hundreds of directives and memos in order to keep their operation in harmony with the other related governmental functions.

To cite an example, a recent editorial in the **Washington Post** noted, "There are no fewer than 160 interdepartmental and interagency committees dealing with international affairs in addition to the National Security Council and its subordinate instruments."[1]

Another aspect of the problem stems from the decentralized nature of many government agencies. The federal government is by its very nature national in scope, and there is in consequence a large volume of correspondence in the form of letters, regulations and reports between Washington, D. C. agencies and their field representatives. The field representatives receive most of their guidance through written communications supplemented only by occasional visits from the Washington staff.

Volume, however, is not the only problem. Difficulties also arise from the unique position of the executive in government. The federal executive is primarily concerned with the implementation of legislation and policy. He is engaged in the difficult task of translating the abstract into the concrete. In carrying out this responsibility he is open to criticism from several sources—the congressional committees who review the activities of federal agencies, the special interest groups in Washington and the general public.

On more than one occasion career civil service men have been made the scapegoat for unpopular policies and under these circumstances most government officials have become very cautious and deliberate in their reading. They frequently read every letter, memo and article with the same scrutiny they would give an executive order.

All of these factors have encouraged an interest in reading improvement in government. Most officials recognize that they have a definite reading problem and for about ten years the interest in and popularity of reading improvement programs has steadily increased.

The first reading improvement program in Washington, D. C. was started by the Air Force at the Pentagon in May, 1949.[2] Seven years later in 1956, Dowell reported that there were 23 government reading programs in operation, and by 1960 Ralph S. Acker of the U. S. Army Engineer School found about 150 reading programs active.[3]

In a recent survey conducted by the author, every major government agency reported that it had sponsored such courses or participated in courses conducted by other agencies or organizations. It is evident that adult reading improvement courses in government have achieved a permanent place in training programs.

From the very beginning reading improvement instructors in government have kept close ties with the research and teaching of developmental reading being conducted by the colleges and universities. Most of the reading improvement programs in existence in Washington use the materials and textbooks which are in use in the college programs.

Certainly the people in government reading programs have kept in touch with reading programs being conducted by the colleges and universities in Washington, D. C., and to some extent throughout the United States. In general one could say that reading improvement in government patterns itself pretty closely on existing college and university programs. There are, however, certain differences between the two kinds of programs which should be noted.

In the first place reading improvement in government is part of a training program and not educational in the strictest sense of that word. In government, as in industry, the objective of training is to make the employee more effective on the job. Reading improvement in the university is free to concern itself with individual growth. It can cover a wide range of reading materials from the esthetic to the philosophical. Above all it can concentrate on the problem of understanding. In a sense, college developmental reading has a major goal—the task of teaching the student to think, i.e., to reason, to evaluate, to read critically. In a broad sense developmental reading enhances the student's ability to deal with the esthetic and intellectual tradition of his culture. But the training officer in government who sponsors a reading improvement program is chiefly interested in improving the ability of on the job reading of his personnel. This means that government programs, to be successful, must limit the kinds of reading material to those similar or related to administration and manage-

ment. Literature and literary appreciation are not usually encouraged by those sponsoring and paying for the reading training.

Moreover the students themselves have a very practical attitude toward reading improvement. Most of them call it "speed reading" or "rapid reading", and nine out of ten on a pre-training questionnaire will express their reading problem as the need to read faster. The idea of reading fast is very popular with the professional people in government and one of the chief justifications for the reading training is that time can be saved by teaching employees to read faster. We are a very time conscious society and any thing that saves time is supposed to save money. One of the best ways to gain support of reading improvement at top executive levels is to stress the dollar and cents value of the hours saved by improving on the job reading.

Moreover it has been observed that reading programs which did not concentrate at least part of its program on saving time through speed reading or skimming or some related technique tend to lose the support of personnel and training officers even though the course may be very effective in improving comprehension or critical reading.

In other words a successful training program in government or industry must show some kind of tangible results which can be readily translated into a supposed monetary gain.

The instructor of reading improvement in government must be concerned with application and production rather than with research and theory.

In summary, this paper has discussed the scope and effectiveness of reading improvement in government. Three main points about government reading programs have been brought out. First, government reading programs recognize that the reading problem of government officials is due to the quantity of reading they must do and to their poor reading habits, especially inflexibility. Second, government reading programs have sought to solve this problem by using various techniques and materials. The people who operate these programs have shared their experiences and have used this combined knowledge along with the research and literature in the field of developmental reading to improve and expand their courses. Third, governmental reading programs are a part of the government training program and as such are more limited in scope than college programs. Although the trainee may derive additional benefits from the course, the program is primarily concerned with increasing job efficiency through reading improvement.

Footnotes

1. "Tools for the President," **The Washington Post,** (November 22, 1960.) p. A12.
2. Fulker, Edmund N., "Air Force Reading Training in the Pentagon," in Oscar S. Causey (ed.), **Fifth Yearbook of the Southwest Reading Conference for Colleges and Universities**. Texas Christian University Press, Fort Worth, Texas, 1956. pp. 77-79.
3. Acker, Ralph S., "Reading Improvement in Military, Government, and Business Agencies," in **The Reading Teacher,** (September, 1961.) PP. 89-92.

STUDY-SKILLS COURSES IN MEDICAL SCHOOLS

George Entwisle

University of Maryland School of Medicine

Over the years, more and more colleges have instituted study-skills courses, so that one can now say that almost all colleges and universities offer such courses, at least to selected group of students. There is also a significant body of published data regarding the effectiveness of such courses. On the other hand, there is very little information on the use of such courses at the graduate level. The purpose of this review is to point out that medical students might benefit from study-skills courses especially tailored to fit their needs, and to summarize the evidence that exists relating to this proposal.

It has long been taken for granted that factors other than aptitude influence achievement in medical school, and fortunately one can assume that most medical students are probably well motivated. On the other hand, little notice, until recently, has been taken of study habits of medical students, although there is ample evidence that study habits can also be significant determiners of achievements[1, 2]. At first thought, it might seem that medical students, being a highly select group, possess good study habits when they enter medical school. As we shall see, there is little justification for this assumption.

You are all familiar with the voluminous evidence that college students may be exceedingly poor readers and it is possible that these deficiencies in reading skill persist in medical school, because students do not ordinarily increase their reading rates in college unless a regular program is undertaken[3].

Of all the study-skills, reading has been by far the one most exclusively studied and different tests have been used to measure study mechanics at different educational levels. One would prefer to have data from medical students on the basis of a reading test tailor-made for them. Although some thought has been given to the construction of a tailor-made reading test for medical students, no such test is presently available. The vast majority of data for medical students is from the Davis Reading Test; a test originally developed for use by senior high school students and college undergraduates.

About fifteen years ago, Sheldon[4] reported that only three of sixteen freshman and sophomore medical students, tested by him, read as well as the average college freshman, before a program in remedial reading was begun. More recently, a pilot study was done using the Davis Reading Test with a sample of approximately one thousand freshman medical students[5]. This study was instigated by the Research and Educational Committee of the Association of American Medical Colleges and was actually carried out by the Psychological Corporation. We may summarize this study by saying that there is variation on Davis Reading Test scores in freshman medical

students and also, in some schools, there may be a significant correlation between reading test scores and performance in medical school. However, no clear case can be made for a unique contribution of the reading test and additional data are needed. One is, however, encouraged to pursue the matter further.

As mentioned, no data are available to indicate the beneficial effects of study-skills courses in medical schools, as compared to an appropriately selected control group. There are, however, such data from the evaluation of college and university courses. Recent reviews[6, 7] indicated a total of nineteen evaluations of college study-skills courses reported in the literature, and all reports noted improvement following the courses, although the amount of improvement varied. In each case, the criterion to measure improvement following a study-skills course was improvement in overall scholastic average as measured from a base line established by a suitable control group. One can say that positive results have been obtained on many occasions, with many kinds of students, and following many kinds of courses. With respect to the amount of improvement, one can summarize these evaluation studies as indicating that the modal gain of overall average seems to be about one-half a grade point, and it can be concluded that gains from such courses at the college level are often large enough to command interest. It is noteworthy that improvement is almost always maintained when follow-up studies are done.

These college course evaluations suggest that medical students might benefit from similar courses, but since different skills are required at different educational levels, it is probable that a successful course for medical students must be especially designed for them. What should be covered in a course is not certain and must be determined only by empirical investigation. Other kinds of reading skills, suitable to scientific texts and articles, may have potential value. Special reading skills that might facilitate learning of medical material are: (a) attention to the logical divisions of chapters indicated by section headings; (b) interpretation of figures and graphs; (c) survey of the preface and bibliography. A recent review[8] of twenty years' experience with reading training at Harvard College suggests that students' "strategy" in reading may need improvement—i.e., often reading assignments are undertaken in a plodding fashion and with scant attention to the overall purpose of the assignment. Reading training should not be dismissed too quickly since in most remedial reading courses speed is emphasized. Mental test theory supports the notion that speed and power (comprehension) are independent and should be treated as separate entities[9]. One investigation[10], focusing on this dichotomy, pointed up the significance of reading comprehension. With altered emphasis on reading training, i.e., with training directed more towards comprehension and reading "strategy", the outcome with medical students might be encouraging.

In the remaining moments, let me review briefly some of the plans we have for use of study-skills courses at our medical school. We are planning to have a remedial reading course for medical students which will

be held in the summer months, hopefully to begin this summer. This will be an elective course for those students who are spending the summer in the Baltimore area, working in some fellowship capacity at our Hospital and Medical School. By an appropriate design, we hope to have a control group of students, equally motivated, with whom we can compare follow-up data. The follow-up data will be academic performance of the students, both in their courses in the Medical School, and grades obtained in national competitive examinations.

Several weeks ago, we began collecting data on our student body, using the Davis Reading Test, and soon we will have reading scores from this test on all the students in the Medical School, numbering about four hundred. We can then learn of the variation in reading ability of our own medical students and also compare their reading scores with academic performance to date. The summary data on our medical students will not be available for three or four more weeks and I am unable to present any of it to you at this time.

In summary, a review of the evaluation of study-skills courses in colleges and undergraduate schools would indicate that a noticeable improvement in academic achievement is obtained. There are data which would indicate that there is a wide range of reading ability among medical students, and that in some schools there may be a correlation between scores on the Davis Reading Test and academic performance. A specific study is planned to test the hypothesis that a remedial reading course for medical students would be beneficial in terms of their academic performance.

Footnotes

1. Carter, H. D., "Mechanics of Study Procedure." **Calif. J. Educ. Research** 9:8-13, 1958.
2. Chabbasi, P., "Analysis of Cornell Orientation Inventory Items of Study Habits and Their Relative Value in Prediction of College Achievement." **J. Educ. Research**, 51:117-28, 1957.
3. Lauer, A. H., "An Experimental Study of the Improvement in Reading by College Students." **J. Educ. Psychol** 27:655-62, 1936.
4. Sheldon, W., "An Evaluation of an Experimental Reading Program for Medical Students." **J. Educ. Psychol.**, 39:298-303, 1948.
5. Report on Pilot Study of the Value of Adding a Reading Test to the MCAT. The Psychological Corporation, 1961. I am indebted to Paul J. Sanazaro, M. D., Director, Division of Education, A.A.M.C., and Richard S. Melton, Ph.D., Assistant Director, Professional Examination Division, The Psychological Corporation, for permission to cite these data.
6. Entwisle, D. R., "Evaluation of Study-Skills Courses: A Review." **J. Educ. Research**, 35:243-51, 1960.
7. Entwisle, G. and Entwisle, D. R., "Study-Skills Courses in Medical School." **J. Medical Educ.**, 35:843-48, 1960.
8. Perry, W. G., "Students' Use and Misuse of Reading Skills: A Report to a Faculty." **Harvard Educ. Rev.**, 29:193-200, 1959.
9. Guilford, J. P., **Psychometric Methods**, pp. 368 ff. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1954.
10. Plexotto, H. E., "The Relationship of College Board Examination Scores and Reading Scores for College Freshmen." **J. Appl. Psychol.**, 30:406-11, 1946.

THE PROGRESSIVE CHOICE READING PROGRAM

Myron Woolman

The Institute of Educational Research

Information important enough for dissemination is generally recorded in the visual codes termed "printing" and "writing". The mounting complexity and technicalization of Western civilization has increased the relative importance of the decoding skill we term "reading." The rapid digestion of large masses of printed documents by scientists, technologists, professional people and the population at large has become not only a necessity for maintaining technological growth, but may be decisive for survival. Thus, the development of rapid and precise reading skills is vital for establishing individual careers; central to the growth of science and technology; and an index to the level of civilization itself.

Reading is defined as the operation of decoding meaningful visual symbols into speech equivalents. The reader must be able to establish some congruency between visual patterns and meaningful aural patterns; or, more succinctly, the reader must translate a visual input into its voiced equivalent. The meaningfulness of a word's visual pattern thus depends on a prior acquisition of its meaningful aural pattern. An article now in process of completion by the writer, based on several recent experiments with human subjects, adds confirming evidence for (1) the importance of sequential relationships, (2) similarity relationships, and (3) response requirements for human learning.[1]

The present Progressive Choice Reading Method was designed to control (1) sequence of letter presentation, (2) their similarity relations, and (3) the response conditions.

A general requirement in the organization of the Progressive Choice Reading Method was that the number of possible response alternatives should be increased only on the basis of demonstrated proficiency. Thus, there is a progressive increase in the number of possible choices as learning proceeds. These objectives are central to the reading method which ultimately evolved, termed the Progressive Choice Reading Method; the number of learner choices increases only on the basis of demonstrated proficiency.

Description of Progressive Choice Reading Method

The reading process is viewed as a system of decoding a set of visual forms used to represent speech. The dominating goal of the Progressive Choice Reading Method is to facilitate the development of those perceptual skills necessary to extract meaning from the printed page. The mechanisms which are used to obtain this objective are:

1. The organization of the body of reading material into graded levels of complexity, by means of three reading cycles:
   a. Cycle I; the learner is restricted to phonetically consistent letters.

b. Cycle II; the learner is restricted to phonetically consistent compounds or letter groups.
c. Cycle III; the learner is exposed to varying sounds for the same letters and varying letters for the same sound.

Within each cycle, the body of material to be learned is organized into segments consisting of two or three learning elements. The learner progresses through a series of controlled steps which are organized to permit him to shift his understandings of selected terms from spoken speech to the printed page. The steps are:

a. Segment Learning Objectives: Words which the learner must ultimately read in a given segment are used in spoken form and the learner must demonstrate understanding (context of usage) of each term.
b. Discrimination Level: The learner must show that he can discriminate the characteristic features of each new learning element among dissimilar and similar alternatives.
c. Identification Level: The learner must demonstrate that he can "label" (give the relevant sound for) each new learning element.
d. Compounding Level: The learner must demonstrate that he can blend sounds when shown printed letter compounds, and print letter compounds on hearing blended sounds.
e. Visual Meaning Level: The learner must demonstrate (by printing and sounding completed terms in the relevant context) that he can use the aural and visual modes interchangeably for the same term.

Learning is cumulative and progressive. Each new learning element is used to form new letter combinations and words. Thus, the learner's meaningful vocabulary expands rapidly with each element and each segment. The learner must establish mastery of a given segment (and all combinations of words formed with elements in preceding segments) before proceeding to the next segment. This is accomplished through End-of-Segment Check-Out Tests which evaluate his level of mastery and also provide a diagnostic tool if the learner is experiencing difficulty.

The presentation to the learner is on an element-by-element basis. He is responsible for learning only one new item at a time. Several additional techniques are employed to reduce the complexity of the learning task. These include:

1. Delaying learning of the alphabet until the names of the letters and their sequence can be used functionally for spelling, listing, and locating terms.
2. Delaying the presentation of lower case forms until upper case forms are correctly sounded and printed.

Thus, the learner maintains a one-to-one relationship between sounds and forms in the intial stages of learning, and is introduced to more complex relationships in stages after demonstrating his competency to read at a given level of complexity.

Validational Progressive Choice Studies

Bloomer's[2] experimentation is mainly responsible for building the body of evidence supporting the practical utility of the Progressive Choice Reading Method in the classroom. He taught the Progressive Choice Reading Method to his student teachers both at Wichita University and and Geneseo State Teachers College, and developed the necessary support materials for these students: manuals that teachers use in the classroom, a phonetically consistent word list, and indices relating similarity between letters and similarity between the sounds. In addition Dr. Bloomer ran a series of studies to compare the effectiveness of the Progressive Choice Reading Method with conventional methods, using first grade children as experimental and control subjects. He performed six studies in all and, in all cases, the children given the Progressive Choice method were superior at statistically significant levels to children learning to read by conventional methods.

Table 1

Summary of Six Experimental Studies
Comparing PC and Conventional Reading Methods
Achievement Level of First Grade Pupils by Percent

Teaching Method	Number of Classes	Number of Pupils	Achievement Level 1.0-1.99	2.0-2.99	3.0-3.99	Total %
Progressive Choice	7	178	6%	52%	42%	100
Combined Other Methods	15	383	29%	53%	18%	100

Chi Square = 138.21
P less than .001 using actual numbers of subjects

Davy[3], in a recent study exploring the Progressive Choice Reading Method, obtained extremely encouraging results in teaching reading skills to mentally retarded children. The study is, however, subject to criticism on several grounds: (1) it lacked a control group; (2) Davy taught the class herself and was probably more motivated and knowledgeable than could be expected of the typical teacher; (3) the evaluations of student skills used non-standard test.

On the other hand, there are not standard reading tests developed for a mentally retarded population. Also, the difference in performance between initiation and conclusion of training provides a basic type of control similar to that used in the biological and physical sciences where measurable changes in the material under observation are customarily used as indices. With reference to the fact that Davy taught the classes, it is clear from her thesis that she was handicapped by available teaching time and poor facilities.

Although the Davy study offers no definitive proof that the Progressive Choice Reading Method will necessarily be effective in teaching mentally retarded children to read, it offers strong encouragement in this direction. Further evidence should be obtained through a carefully controlled study

being performed by the Institute of Educational Research under a three year grant from the National Institute of Mental Health.[4] This study, titled "A Programmed Reading Method for the Mentally Handicapped" is now in its initial phase. It has been designed with control groups, the use of standard tests, and will have a minimum sample of 200 retarded children assigned to the Progressive Choice Reading Method. On its completion, a more complete statement as to the functional value of the Progressive Choice Method will be available.

1. These studies were performed while the author was a member of the staff of the Human Resources Research Office, George Washington University, and should be completed within the year. Their data offers support for the following statements: (1) sequence of presentation of material vitally affects learning outcomes; (2) the number of choices which the learner must make (all other factors constant) affects learning outcomes. It should be noted that both these factors affect the probability of a correct response.
2. Bloomer, R. H., "An Investigation of an Experimental First Grade Phonics Program," **Journal of Educational Research**, LIII, 1960, pp. 188-193. "An Approach to the Teaching of Reading." (An address to the Buffalo Invitational Conference on the Progressive Choice Program in Reading, May, 1961). "Reading Methodology: An Experimental Test of Some Alternative Organizational Principles," **The Reading Teacher**, January, 1961, pp. 167-171.
3. Davy, Ruth A., "An Experimental Method of Teaching Reading to Severely Retarded Children" (Unpublished Master of Arts Thesis, University of Maryland, 1961.) "Adaptation of The Progressive Choice Method for Teaching Reading to Retarded Children," **American Journal of Mental Deficiency**, Vol. 67, No. 2, (Sept., 1962).
4. "A Programmed Reading Method for the Mentally Handicapped," A Research Proposal by the Institute of Educational Research, Principal Investigator, Myron Woolman; Project Director, Ruth Ann Davy, M.A.; (Grant Awarded, June 1962.)

IMPLEMENTING READING INSTRUCTION BY CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISION IN WASHINGTON COUNTY (MD.) SCHOOLS

Velora V. Swauger

Direct instruction in reading via closed-circuit television in the Washington County School System has been offered as a special service since September, 1958. Through this televised direct teaching of reading is made provision of activities for the maintenance, reinforcement, and extension of reading skills. The specific function of the televised reading programs is to implement classroom reading instruction.

Two televised reading programs are presented. One, the two-track Controlled Reader Program, is scheduled for two fifteen minute telecasts weekly in each track. A second offering, the three-track Reading Skills Program, is scheduled for a total of six fifteen to twenty minute telecasts weekly.

The Controlled Reader Program

The purpose of the Controlled Reader Program is to improve the reading rate and comprehension of each participating pupil in all the reading he does.

Controlled Reading A is offered for those pupils whose reading achievement level is fourth grade or below. The selections progress in dif-

ficulty from first through fourth grade. Controlled Reading B is offered for those pupils whose reading achievement level is fourth grade or above. Beginning at fourth grade level at a rate of one hundred twenty words per minute, the content difficulty and rate are gradually increased to sixth grade level at two hundred twenty-five words per minute.

The preparation of the participant for the televised lesson is left to the judgment of his classroom teacher. In addition to her own approaches to preparing the participant, the classroom teacher may use the vocabulary lists and suggested questions for each selection which the studio teacher provides.

The studio teacher introduces the reading selection and helps the participant develop a general purpose for reading. In the classroom the participant then reads from the television screen as the rate-controlled continuous reading selection is projected in a beam of left-to-right guided light for a period of four to five minutes.

Following his reading, while still under the direction of the studio teacher, the participant checks his comprehension. The comprehension exercises vary in number and type according to the difficulty and kind of content of the selection. Directed by the studio teacher the participant then records his reading rate and comprehension score for the selection on his individual Television Reading Progress Record.

After the telecast, in his class group situation, the participating pupil may continue vocabulary study, discuss his understanding of the selection in terms of his reading purpose, identify and organize ideas gained, express his understandings through creative activities, or extend his reading interests to related content. From time to time, the classroom teacher uses informal checks to determine the participant's growth and transfer in reading rate and comprehension skills.

The Reading Skills Program

The function of the Reading Skills Program is to improve the basic reading skills of each pupil who, in the judgment of his classroom teacher, will profit from his participation in these televised lessons.

This three-track skills program is a systematic sequence. The major emphasis is placed upon skills in word analysis, dictionary use, and listening. Fundamentally, the content is that of a basal reader developmental skills program.

Reading Skills A, the first track, develops and applies in the context of one-syllable words those word analysis skills generally taught at first and second grade levels. With emphasis on phonetic and structural analysis, this segment of the skills sequence begins with letter recognition and discrimination and continues with consonants, consonant digraphs and blends, vowels, dictionary readiness, and adding endings involving no change in the root, doubling the final consonant, changing y to i, and dropping the final silent e in the root.

Reading Skills B, the second track, begins with a review of the major concepts of Skills A; builds and extends skills in phonetic and structural

analysis dealing with syllabication, accent, inflected and derived forms; and adds helps in the skills of using the dictionary. In the televised lessons of this track the skills generally taught at third and fourth grade levels are developed and applied in the context of two-or-more syllable words.

Reading Skills C, the third track, provides direct teaching of listening skills in word perception, comprehension of ideas, and using ideas to build undestandings in science, social studies, and special informational material. In addition, lessons in more advanced skills of phonetic and structural analysis are presented. This third segment of the skills sequence is designed for pupils in grades four, five, and six.

In the preparation of the participant for the telecast, the classroom teacher may have him recall and discuss the related previous lesson or lessons and his understandings of the concept of the new lesson. During the telecast, the participant may work along independently with the studio teacher or with some guidance from his classroom teacher. After the televised lesson, under the direction of his classroom teacher, the pupil may apply his skills and understandings in activities associated with his developmental reading, his spelling or other word lists, his content subjects, illustrated charts and booklets, audio-visual materials, word games, or original ideas.

Participation in the Programs

Participation in the televised reading programs is a matter for decision by the classroom teacher. A classroom teacher may try out and select one or more tracks in terms of the reading needs, abilities, and interests of her pupils. An entire class may participate in a given track or because of the needs of specific pupils or groups two or more tracks may be used in a particular classroom. In some cases, selected pupils from one or more classrooms may meet in a designated viewing area for participation under the guidance of a special teacher.

Nearly all of the more than ten thousand pupils in grades one through six participate in some part of the two programs at some time during the year. A pupil who enters a particular track continues to participate as long as the nature and difficulty of the content meet his needs and challenge his interest and ability yet enable him to experience success.

Television Aids and Effects

Direct teaching by television affords opportunities for unique approaches not possible in the classroom. In the skills telecasts original and adapted techniques and effects are used. Besides providing additional practice in and application of basic skills for all participants, this televised instruction more readily effects a breakthrough in the reading problems of some pupils than does the use of classroom practices usually followed in such cases.

To capture the interest of the participating pupil and to involve him in a personalized learning situation, the studio teacher makes use of numerous materials and methods. Visual aids and special effects provide motivated motion or the suggestion of motion and change of pace for the participant as he works along with the studio teacher.

The use of motion or the suggestion of motion; simplicity in the design and arrangement of aids to insure ease in viewing and clarity of understanding; and the use of special techniques for camera, lighting, and sound are fundamental to the effectiveness of the televised lesson. Such devices and procedures encourage the pupil to participate through listening, seeing, imitation, imaginative play, and application of learnings.

The impact of simultaneous sight and sound effects strengthens the pupil's visual, auditory, and thinking skills and makes for greater efficiency in his learning process.

The Teaching Team

In televised instruction, the studio teacher is a member of a teaching team. For a given telecast she is a member of as many teams as the total number of different classroom teachers whose pupils are participating. At other times the studio teacher and a cross-sectional group, as a planning or an evaluating committee representing different levels from different schools, are a teaching team.

Generally speaking, each member of the studio-teacher team assumes certain responsibilities. The studio teacher concentrates on the teaching of her subject, studying in depth the content, materials for instruction, and methods of presentation. She combines the best suggestions of other members of the teaching team with her own ideas in **what** she teaches and **how** she teaches. She outlines the total program as scheduled for the school year, then plans and writes the script for each televised lesson. With the assistance of production personnel and a graphic artist she develops and presents each lesson in the television studio. For use in the classroom, the studio teacher prepares advance guide materials for classroom teachers, learning materials for pupils, and forms for recording pupil progress and reporting pupil participation. To get from pupils and classroom teachers first-hand reaction to her teaching and suggestions for making improvements, the studio teacher visits classrooms. Occasionally she is present in a classroom as her pre-taped lesson is being viewed. To receive further suggestions and to get evaluation of her work, she makes casual contacts with pupils and classroom teachers or uses informal year-end surveys on which classroom teachers submit their observations and suggestions. By invitation, she meets with other school and community groups as PTA's and service clubs. She participates in in-service telecasts with and for members of her teaching team.

The classroom-teacher member of the teaching team shares, as requested, in the planning of the basic courses to be taught. She makes suggestions as to content, teaching resources to be used, methods of presentation, and classroom utilization.

In the classroom, the classroom teacher arranges the physical setting for viewing the telecast and creates a good climate for learning. She develops readiness and motivation for participation in the televised lesson. During the telecast, the classroom teacher observes, encourages, and assists pupils in participation, and notes significant behavior and reactions that

will be useful in her guidance of learning activities that follow the telecast. Post-telecast learning experiences which will provide individual and group needs relating to difficulties met during the telecast and to the extension and application of learnings are planned by the classroom teacher. The classroom teacher communicates to the studio teacher reactions of her pupils and suggestions for improvement of the televised lessons. She evaluates her pupils' growth and reports to parents.

On the teaching team there are no status positions. Each member is an expert as a professional person. Ingredients for the success of the teaching team as summarized by a team group include the following: awareness of the needs of the students; agreement on philosophy, goals, and procedures; awareness of individual responsibilities; a free and constant interchange of ideas, constructive criticism; a sharing of the credit for success and the responsibility for failure; efforts to build the morale and extend the potential of one another; and willingness to complement (and compliment) and supplement the other.

Evaluation of the Reading Programs

Evaluation of the televised reading programs is a responsibility of the teaching team. In the interest of effective evaluation, the teaching team members make use of many opportunities for communication. General appraisal of some areas of some telecasts is made through the use of telephone conversations. Insight into the value and use of a few lessons is gained through classroom visits by the studio teacher. Evaluation of various aspects of the programs results from meetings of representative classroom teachers with the studio teacher. The extent of participation of the pupils in one or more tracks of the programs is indicated by classroom teachers on monthly participation reports submitted through principals. Observations and suggestions by classroom teachers on year-end surveys are summarized and shared. The significant general recommendations for making the whole televised reading program more effective are incorporated into the planning for the following year.

When classroom-teacher members of the reading teaching team are asked, "What evidence do you see that the Controlled Reader Program is serving its purpose of improving the reading rate and comprehension of your pupils?", these teachers note:

"increased concentration in other subjects"
"improved vocabulary, understanding multiple meanings of words"
"extended reading for research"
"awareness of increased speed and comprehension, use of self-checks, working against the clock to maintain rate and comprehension"
"extended recreational reading—more books in less time, sharing related reading experiences, knowledge of subject areas which otherwise would not likely have."

To the question, "What evidence do you see that the Reading Skills Program is achieving its goal in supplementing your classroom instruction in the development of basic reading skills?", classroom teachers mention:

"sight vocabulary extended and fixed"
"alertness to words, experimenting with words on own"
"more 'voluntary' use of the dictionary"
"listening and visual perception improved"
"independence in following directions"
"improved spelling and English"

"sustained memory, recall and reference to TV reading when working in reading and other learning situations"
"concepts clarified and fixed"
"carry-over of learnings in listening skills lessons"
"lessons in outlining so worthwhile all children in the county should see them."

Many lasting values of televised direct teaching of reading may remain subtle and hidden beyond our threshold of observation and evaluation. No studio teacher, however, should have reason to hide the feeling of satisfaction that comes from the realization that in more than four hundred classrooms she finds individual eye-to-eye contact with each of some ten thousand pupils and in a very personal way helps to supplement his instruction in reading.